The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 28, 1902.

The Week.

President Roosevelt went further at Boston than he had gone at Providence. He did so by arguing for national regulation not only of Trusts, or of great combinations, or of corporations doing an interstate business, but of all corporations whatsoever. His words were, "Remember, I say corporations. I do not say merely Trusts, merely combinations of corporations, or corporations under certain peculiar conditions." This means that he would have the national Government sovereign and directive in the case of every corporation doing business anywhere in this country. That sounds revolutionary, but really it amounts to no more than asserting that the United States ought to have what England has—a Companies Act. A national corporation law would be on all fours with a national bankruptcy law. Whether we shall get it or not, is another question. We ourselves do not think that we shall for many years to come. A Constitutional amendment would almost certainly be a necessary preliminary, and to talk about what we shall do after the Constitution is amended is very like predicting our action after larks have fallen from the sky. As the Senate is now constituted, it would be impossible to induce it to agree to an amendment limiting the powers of corporations in any radical manner. Practical and actual reform, we think, therefore, is more likely to come in other ways. By improving and harmonizing the corporation laws of the various States, so as to make them conform to the Massachusetts type, and to destroy those snug harbors which piratical speculators find in the lax laws, limply enforced, of certain States, we are more apt to make real progress than by dropping everything to go in for national control. If State courts, furthermore, were to assert a more continuing sovereignty of the State over the corporation which it creates, it is easy to see that an effective step in advance would be taken.

The President's words on Saturday about the mischief of "great fortunes not used aright," and about the "ugly baldness" of the follies and vices displayed by "the wicked who prosper," will find an echo in many hearts. They fall fittingly at a time when ostentation by the vulgar rich has been reaching its acme of offensiveness, when the gambling spirit, both in finance and in high play by the admired plungers at Saratoga, has been rampant, and when press and public have stood staring or been running agape at every rumor or authentic report of luxury surpassing all records for fantastic or barbaric forms. It is good to have a Chief Magistrate to whom all this is so frankly repellent, and who lets it be known that it is. In view, however, of the very obvious lurch to luxury which this country has taken since the Spanish war, we think that Mr. Roosevelt and others of his way of thinking and talking about the discipline of war would do well to revise their theories. They held up war to us, it will be remembered, as the great moral tonic of which a luxurious age was in need. It was to prevent our fibre from deteriorating. It was to make us live laborious days. Under the sharp appeal of military duty, the nation was to cease to think about the comforts and elegancies of life, was to give up reckoning happiness in terms of the bank account, and was to scorn all delights except the stern joy of the warrior. This theory always seemed to us bizarre psychologically and ludicrous historically. Being brutalized or else made sybaritic by the luxury which always sweeps in with new floods in war-time, has been the historic danger of war. Capua is never far from Cannæ. Napoleon's wars did not exactly make the French a modest, simple people, despising the pleasures of sense. Even a struggle so essentially heroic and ideal as our civil war was attended and followed by an invasion of insensate displays of new-found wealth. George Ticknor was no Cato the Censor, yet he wrote to a friend abroad in the days of the desperate fighting between the Rapidan and Richmond in 1864, "Meanwhile, luxury reigns as it never did before in Boston, New York, and through the North generally."

Mr. Roosevelt rendered a public service at Hartford on Friday, when he administered a deserved rebuke to sundry "first citizens" who had tried to snub the Mayor of the city because he was only a salesman in a clothing-store when he was elected. The natural and proper thing, of course, would have been to pursue the same course at Hartford in the reception of the President as at New Haven earlier in the afternoon—that is, have the chief magistrate of the city meet him on his arrival and accompany him in his carriage. This would have been done if the Mayor had been a "leading citizen"; but, as he is not, he was thrust aside at the railroad station and put in the third carriage, while a rich and prominent business man was called upon to act as host for Hartford. As soon as Mr. Roosevelt learned the situation, he sent word to the Mayor that he should be pleased to see him at the house where he was to stay, and in opening his speech that evening he took pains to mention the Mayor by name and to recognize him as the official who represented the city on such an occasion. Altogether it was a most proper rebuke of a discourtesy which discredited all who were responsible for it.

Study of the Congressional conventions which are now being held from week to week in different sections of the country continues to be highly interesting. The reprehensible tendency in both parties towards a "go-as-you-please race" in the various districts has reached its climax in Wisconsin. In the Milwaukee district of that State the Democrats have just nominated a young lawyer for Congress, and adopted no declaration of principles whatever. The attitude of the Democrats is less important in Wisconsin, which is Republican by a large majority, than in Nebraska, where the Opposition now have four of the six Representatives, and there will be much curiosity in the East to know what questions are pushed to the front there. The Democratic convention in the district which includes Omaha nominated a candidate for Congress on Saturday week, and adopted a platform presenting the issues considered most promising in that region. No allusion is made to the matter of Cuban reciprocity, which is the burning question in the neighboring State of Kansas—it must be remembered that Nebraska has a number of sugar-beet factories; nor is there any reference to the Philippine issue. The Fowler banking bill is condemned as "designed to build up a gigantic banking Trust, and to place in the hands of a few great banks the control of the banking facilities and finances of the country"; compulsory arbitration is favored in disputes between capital and labor "in all cases where the public becomes a sufferer," and such legislation as may be necessary to secure this is favored. But chief stress is laid upon "the tremendous growth and multiplication of Trusts under Republican rule, and the enormous tribute those Trusts have wrung from the American people"; and, as a means of securing relief, it is declared that "we favor legislation by Congress which shall remove tariff duties on Trust-made goods, and place under Government supervision and control corporations which have acquired monopoly powers in the business world."

While public interest in the revision of the tariff is obviously more general and keen beyond the Alleghenies than in the Eastern part of the country, there are indications in New York and New England that Republicanism is disturbed by the issue even in those States most

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strongly wedded to the protective system. There is, for example, a growing agitation among the shoe and leather interests of New England for a removal of the duty on hides, which they find it increasingly hard to endure. Still more significant is the recent breach in the American Protective Tariff League, which has its headquarters in New York city. When the question of Cuban reciprocity became acute, the board of managers held a meeting, and a majority, with characteristic stupidity, decided that the League must oppose any such measure because its constitution declares the object of the body to be the protection of American labor by a tariff on imports "which shall adequately secure American industrial products against the competition of foreign labor." Thereupon Cornelius N. Bliss, who was one of the founders of the League, and its president for seven years, resigned from the Board of Managers, and five other members of the League went out with him on the same issue.

Republican party organs in Illinois are making efforts to explain away the recent revelations concerning the 5 per cent. assessment of State employees, but they are finding their task a difficult one. Even the Chicago *Tribune*, which, while strongly Republican, can hardly be described as a party organ, makes a feeble attempt to show that the real blame for the whole unfortunate state of things rests with the late ex-Gov. Altgeld, who, the *Tribune* says, devised the assessment system, and left it in full operation to his Republican successor, Gov. Tanner. Gov. Tanner, it appears, weakly fell into a temptation so alluring, and passed the system on to Gov. Yates, who evidently received it with enthusiasm. The plea of the strictly party organs is less apologetic. The "contributions" were "voluntary," they declare, and the expenditure was "legitimate"; the money, "generally speaking," having been used to subsidize a long list of country newspapers through the "yearly subscription plan." The Chicago *Evening Post* remarks that this logic is good enough for some of the inmates of the Kankakee asylum, and it swells the general demand that the next Illinois Legislature shall pass a law prohibiting this barefaced violation of the principles of civil-service reform.

The navy game of 1902 is most likely to be remembered for Rear-Admiral Higginson's excellent parody of a historic surrender. "Keep your sword, sir," he said to Commander Pillsbury, who had sailed plump into the defending fleet—"keep your sword. I could not take the sword of so gallant and noble a foe." It is doubtful if the event deserved any more serious treatment. The manœuvres have proved what everybody already knew, that it would be almost impossible for a hostile fleet to effect a landing on our coast; that an inferior fleet sailing regardlessly up to a superior one sails to destruction; that two fleets may operate in the same waters for a week without either knowing of the other's movements. In fact, these elaborate preparations have, so far as a mere layman can see, merely enforced the trite lesson of the limitations of naval foresight. We shall not be suspected of belittling the performance of the week if we say that the result seems very meagre when one takes into account the number of honest North Shore folk kept up o' nights, the tons of paper that have been blackened, and the waste of amateur strategy that has been involved. Pending the official report which will tell us how much or how little the fiasco off Thatcher's Island has contributed to naval theory, the mock gravity of the two commanders seems the most felicitous comment upon the battle of the fleets.

There is a gospel hymn which bids us all "scatter seeds of kindness." Nowhere is this injunction more faithfully acted upon than in the Department of Agriculture at Washington. In fact, for a long period the Department scattered only this kind of seed. As seed, it used to be alleged that it rarely grew—indeed, that cotton seed was often sent to Maine and buckwheat to Alabama—but it served equally well as a remembrance from one's Congressman and as an assurance that Uncle Sam had a tender care for his farmer boys. The reception of a package was supposed to give to the farmer the kind of thrill that Thackeray had in walking with a lord, or that a British tradesman feels in fingering the card of his M.P. The Department of Agriculture no longer plays this farce, but at least distributes seeds that will grow in the locality to which they are sent. It may be said that this is perilously near converting a courtesy into a dole; the seeds that never grew were, of course, no more useful to a farmer than a carload of cut flowers is to a débutante, and might be accepted without loss of self-respect. It is possibly to evade some scruple which the improvement in the quality of Congressional seed might arouse, that the Department has invented a brand-new method of scattering these seeds of kindness. Small packages containing a selection "suitable for the window-box or small garden," will be distributed to the schools, for the purpose of leading the children into a love for "nature study" and a knowledge of the rudiments of agriculture. Thus every Congressman has a ready means of showing his yearning for the children of his district, and through them of reaching the affections of all mothers who are amateurs of window-boxes and small gardens. It is only when seen from the vantage-point of the Department of Agriculture that practical politics has this idyllic look. The image of those blooming window-boxes fragrantly winning votes is as pleasing as any evoked by the reading of 'Evangeline' or 'Hermann and Dorothea.' To be sure, it costs a matter of $270,000 a year to scatter these seeds of kindness. But what is cash when sentiment is involved?

It is a curious sequel to Mr. Chamberlain's conference of Colonial Premiers that Premier Bond of Newfoundland should take just this occasion to return to the long-suspended Blaine-Bond Convention—a treaty which would constitute an additional obstacle to the incorporation of Newfoundland in the Dominion of Canada. And yet Premier Bond is undoubtedly right in preferring a present good to a remote and dubious benefit, while in this matter Newfoundland has little reason to be grateful to the Dominion. In 1890 Premier Bond negotiated with Mr. Blaine a reciprocity treaty which may briefly be described as the exchange of free bait for free fish. Newfoundland was to waive the various taxes and restrictions concerning the sale of bait, which had long been a source of vexation and unnecessary expense to American fishermen; the United States was to admit fish from Newfoundland free of duty. It would be hard to conceive a fairer exchange. Their bait was indispensable to our fishermen on the Grand Banks; our markets were valuable to their fisheries, which, however, threatened no formidable competition to our own. When the Blaine-Bond Convention was disapproved by Lord Salisbury, at the instance of the Canadian Government, it was understood that the negotiations were merely suspended until the Dominion should complete a similar fisheries arrangement with the United States. Practically, Canada soon occupied a dog-in-the-manger position. Twelve years have passed, and the varying attempts at a general reciprocity agreement between Canada and ourselves have failed. It is clear that the British Government could no longer with any semblance of right prevent Newfoundland from pursuing her independent policy.

We learn that a controversy has arisen in Canada as to whether frogs are fish or game, and that the question has to be decided, "owing to the fact that the exportation of frogs to the United States has become a big business." It seems that if frogs are game, the close season for them must be determined by the Provincial authorities, while if they are fish the Dominion authorities must decide. The question whether they are fish or game concerns Canadians only, but if the exportation of frogs to the United States has become "a big business," we are glad to have our atten-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion called to it, and we want to know what is going to be done about it. We have spoken of this matter before, and pointed out that the only protection given the American frog is a miserable 10 per cent. customs tax on the imported product, carelessly classified among "articles not otherwise enumerated." This has got to stop! Are we so weak that we must consent to stand idly by while "a big business" is going on in Canada, furnishing frogs for our markets, and all the time our own domestic frogs hopping around without the slightest attention from our statesmen? What are Secretary Shaw and Congressman Cannon talking about? Of course, we must have tariff revision, and that speedily. The tariff must be revised in favor of the American frog.

The friendly suggestion of a German newspaper that the United States should "clean up" Hayti, and "enable white men to do business in that country," shows, first, that our qualities as good house-cleaners are beginning to be recognized, which is gratifying; and, second, that the aim of all interference with backward nations for their good is "to do business with them." And yet the Government at Washington is likely to feel that such a suggestion is rather "academically correct"—Secretary Shaw's term for impracticable tariff reduction—than of immediate importance. A little experience of the cleaning-up process has shown us its difficulties, particularly when the cleansing has been applied forcibly to those who prefer their own manner of life and are careless of doing business with the nation which is chastening them for their good. Then, if we once started on the cleaning-up process in the Antilles and in Central and South America, where could we stop? Colombia and Venezuela both have revolutions on hand; Chili, Argentina, and Peru have several outstanding quarrels; while even Bolivia and Brazil are more or less at odds over the "rubber state" of Acre. Possible the German counsellor who would see us start out on a tour of sanitation through the backward American republics, beginning with the "exclusive black régime" of Hayti, forgets that we have a very pretty race problem of our own, for which business in remote regions must wait. If there has been any reflex good from the heedless expansion of recent years, it has been this, that painful experience with other people's house-cleaning has at last recalled certain old-fashioned notions about setting our own house in order. But a German critic could hardly realize how little the American people can to-day be caught by the Imperialist chaff for which its appetite was unlimited, two years ago.

In the *Économiste Français* of August 2, M. Leroy-Beaulieu gives a review of the business situation of the world, two months after the conclusion of peace in South Africa. The expectation of renewed prosperity in consequence of the termination of the war has not been fulfilled. In fact, it ought not to have been expected. The business of war is slaughter, cessation of industry, and destruction of property. It is the reverse of everything which makes "good times." The results of two years of fighting and the unproductive expenditure of a thousand million dollars are not to be erased by signing a treaty of peace. Time alone can restore the useful things which war has swept away. Even the Transvaal gold mines will require two years' trial and a hundred million dollars of fresh capital to put them in as good a position as they were in when the war began. Although the business situation in Europe is not now brilliant, it is, in Leroy-Beaulieu's opinion, highly encouraging, because it promises continued peace. In Turkey alone is there any cause of inquietude. As to the United States, he thinks that speculation has been going at too rapid a pace, and that the scaffolding of our gigantic Trusts does not possess the solidity that might be desired. "It would not be surprising," he says, "if, in the course of a year or eighteen months, there were a strong reaction in the United States, if not even a panic."

The selection of M. J. J. Jusserand as successor to Ambassador Cambon at Washington is in every way a happy one. M. Jusserand has been long in the diplomatic service, and represents the best traditions of the French Foreign Office. He is also an accomplished littérateur, the master of an eloquent English style, and the author of many learned and delightful books on English literature and antiquities. It is these extra-diplomatic qualifications which will make his incumbency at Washington notable. His appointment constitutes a recognition of the strong and increasing comity between French and American scholarship. Personally he will merit and will undoubtedly receive the kind of welcome that England has given to the long line of literary American ambassadors at the Court of St. James's. It is a most graceful sequel to the Rochambeau centenary to send us a man who combines in himself so much that is admirable in French diplomacy, scholarship, and letters; and the news that M. Jusserand, now at Copenhagen, consents to suspend his Scandinavian studies in favor of the American Embassy, will be heartily welcomed.

The announcement that the German Emperor has decided to move his headquarters for the manœuvres from Posen to Frankfort-on-the-Oder will inevitably give rise to the belief that the political crisis in Prussian Poland is far more serious than has been suspected. Only a few weeks ago, it was announced that the Emperor would march into Posen at the head of 100,000 men, like some conquering hero of the Middle Ages, in order to overawe his dissatisfied Polish subjects. Now it appears that the fears of his court officials, who were known to be opposed to his going into so excited a community, have prevailed, and the Emperor and his many guests will be lodged in a city about whose loyalty there can be no doubt, and in which the secret police will have a much easier task. The latest German newspapers are full of the case of a financial official, Herr Löhning, who was removed from his position in Posen because, it was said, he had married a sergeant's daughter. The Government organs which have defended his removal are now attributing the discharge to "pernicious activity" in the Polish agitation. That a large and enthusiastic meeting of protest against the Government's policy should have been held by the Poles in Berlin is also proof of the popular excitement in the matter, which will not be decreased by the Emperor's change of headquarters. Meanwhile the Government is carrying out its plan of fighting the Polish influences by encouraging the immigration of Germans from other portions of the Empire. *Colonization gegen Polonization* is the apt popular characterization of this elaborate scheme.

Mr. Balfour's Ministry got another facer on Friday in what was morally an overwhelming defeat in a strong Conservative constituency. In the by-election in Kent the Tory majority of two years ago was cut nearly 4,000 votes. It is obvious that any such proportionate loss in a general election would drive the Conservatives ignominiously from office. Of course, they still have their large majority in the Commons, which legally is good for five years yet; but a government must have prestige and signs of popular favor behind it, as well as a Parliamentary majority, and such a succession of defeats as the new Ministry has already encountered is terribly damaging. The chief grievances alleged are the Education Bill and the corn tax, but the indications are that the party majority has in general gone stale. It was secured under something very like false pretences in 1900, with the cry that the war was "over"; and now that nothing is really left of the war but its burdens and miseries, the reaction is in full tide. It is a critical period for Mr. Balfour's leadership, and the autumn session of Parliament will show whether he is able to read aright the signs of the times. One may imagine the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain experiencing just now, as he contemplates the plight of Mr. Balfour, the truth of the French saying that there is something agreeable in the misfortunes of one's friends.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENT ON HIS TRAVELS.

President Roosevelt's speech at Hartford on Friday was, for the most part, a rather tedious example of what the Imperialists so greatly deprecate—a harking back to the dead past. Glorification of our motives and of our deeds in the Philippines, albeit with some confusion as to the facts of history, is so easy that we should think a man who so loathes the "easy" as the President does would not so monotonously fall into it. He pointed to our treatment of Porto Rico as the true way to administer our island possessions. But why did he not specify? Why did he not frankly say that the great reason of the Porto Ricans' prosperity and content is that they enjoy free trade with us? Almost at the very moment he was speaking, Gov. Taft was telling the Filipinos in Manila that they deserved free trade and would soon get it. Why could not the President be equally precise, instead of resorting to vague platitudes? The only apparent reason is, that the Republican party is just now torn to pieces over the tariff, and that if Mr. Roosevelt were to say explicitly that we ought to grant free trade to the Philippines, as we have granted it to Porto Rico, he would be rubbing salt into the party's wounds. But surely he cannot go on preferring what he calls "the easy and lazy thing," which would be, in this case, to be silent about an issue which is coming to have the first place politically.

The President's speech at Providence on Trusts was evidently prepared with care and deliberation beforehand, as befits the importance of the subject and the position of the speaker. Although it contains nothing really new, what it says acquires new character and increased force when spoken by the President of the United States. It is a matter of consequence, too, that Mr. Roosevelt's words are not spoken to-day in order to be forgotten to-morrow. Moreover, they do not say, "Good Lord, good devil." Although defective in an important particular, which we shall point out, they compel the Republican party either to adopt an aggressive policy toward Trusts and industrial monopolies, or to confess itself unable to deal with the most momentous question of domestic policy, and therefore unfit longer to govern the country. How this deliverance strikes the "money power" may be learned from the comments of the New York *Sun*, which not obscurely classes the speech with the utterances of Charles E. Littlefield, Eugene V. Debs, and Job Harriman, while it observes that in some ways it goes beyond those of William J. Bryan.

The President declares that the evils of industrial monopoly have reached a point which demand a stronger control than any heretofore employed. The powers of the separate States are either inadequate, or are rendered nugatory by their dispersion in so many different hands. Congressional power is alone capable of dealing effectively with the questions at issue. Whether the needed powers are available under the Constitution as it now stands, is open to some doubt. If they cannot be exercised, then the Constitution should be amended in a way to accomplish the desired end of national control over these industrial combinations. Meanwhile the President believes that Congress has power to enforce publicity upon all corporations doing an interstate business, and that this power should be exercised to the full extent. All the facts relating to Trusts and combines should be exposed. Such publicity, he thinks, would cure many of the evils complained of, but he would not stop there. He would not stop anywhere short of the subjugation of the Trusts to national control.

It has been manifest from the beginning of Mr. Roosevelt's Presidency that he must either take the lead in the campaign against monopolies or resign it to the Democratic party. The case is analogous to that which existed when the two parties were confronted by the Cuban question. If the Republicans did not take the lead in declaring war, the Democrats would become the war party and gain an advantage in the next election. That was the reason why the "stop-watch" was held over President McKinley's head by the party leaders, as the late Mr. Boutelle described. That was the reason why the leaders could not wait a few months to let Spain withdraw from Cuba with dignity. The reason why President Roosevelt cannot hold his peace, even if he wished to, in the presence of the railway mergers and the billion-dollar Trusts, is that the pesky Democrats will not allow him to rest quietly. We do not say, nor do we imply, that he would like to rest. His temperament is of the stirring kind, as he has proved on more than one occasion, and especially when he carried the franchise-tax law through the State Legislature. But if he were ever so fond of his ease, he could not indulge the sedentary habit now.

It is fair to say also that the Trust fabricators and managers are not exactly free moral agents. They, too, are impelled by circumstances. In the case of the great railway merger, it was clear that if the properties concerned were not brought together by these men, they would be manipulated by somebody else somewhat later. In short, we are in the presence of a new irrepressible conflict of opposing forces. None the less must the conflict be fought out to the end. That society will triumph over the Trusts finally, we have no doubt. The problem is to secure the triumph with the least possible violence to sound principles of government.

The glaring defect in President Roosevelt's Providence speech was his failure to take notice of the tariff as an instrument by which the industrial combines, or a portion of them, maintain their power. The very same newspapers which print his speech contain the news that contracts have been made in Chicago for iron and steel from England, because our own furnaces cannot supply the demand. Every pound of material so imported has to pay a heavy duty for the benefit of the Steel Trust and all other home producers. It is needless to say that this duty is unnecessary and is a sheer gratuity. It is needless to say that Congress has the power to repeal this duty, and by so much lessen the power of the Steel Trust. Nor can the President plead ignorance of the public desire for this method of dealing with the Trusts when the conventions of his own party in Iowa, Idaho, and elsewhere are demanding the abolition of such restrictive and unnecessary taxes. So long as Mr. Roosevelt ignores this branch of the question, he leaves his flank exposed to a fire which must become more and more galling as the fight proceeds.

SECRETARY SHAW ON THE TARIFF.

To sustain the Republican contention that it is ridiculous to talk of the tariff as an issue this year, and that Grover Cleveland was a thick-head for saying it is, the Secretary of the Treasury made on August 19 a second speech to the Republicans of Vermont, all about the tariff. It was mostly devoted to explaining that the Iowa Republicans meant nothing in particular when they declared, in State Convention, for tariff revision, and especially for the abolition of all duties that serve to "shelter monopolies." This was only "academic," says Secretary Shaw, and will lead, and was intended to lead, to nothing whatever. We consider this pretty long-range shooting. Mr. Shaw had better go out to Iowa and say it to their faces. The Republicans of his State, when they insisted on overriding in their platform the timid counsels of Shaw and Allison and Wilson, asserted that they were in dead earnest about tariff revision, and especially about shearing away the protection afforded to Trusts. To learn now by way of Vermont that they were only gammoning, will make them wonder if Iowans speak the truth only when away from home.

The Secretary protested, however, that it was a mistake to "quote" him as against tariff revision. He is for it—under certain circumstances. But those circumstances are so impossible of realization that it remains true, unfortunately, that Secretary Shaw is against tariff revision. He is against, that is, any particular change at any particular time. But if the tariff is ever to be revised, the work must be begun at a given time and in a given place. Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shaw lays his hand on his heart and vows that he has never "opposed a readjustment of the tariff." But listen to his explanation: "Whenever Congress reaches the conclusion that the friends of protection are strong enough to conservatively modify certain schedules, so as to meet changed conditions and at the same time successfully resist the efforts of the Opposition to revise the entire tariff law, thus paralyzing business for a season, I shall be in favor of it." Now that is only a roundabout way of saying "never."

Thus we see that Secretary Shaw confesses the helplessness of the Republican party before the tariff problem. It does not defend existing schedules—oh, no! the Secretary protests against that charge almost tearfully. He admits that there are unjust duties, schedules that are fairly crying out for revision. But he takes a great deal of satisfaction in saying again and again that neither he nor his party is "committed" to any of these tariff taxes. But might they not as well be committed to them if they do not propose to touch them or allow others to touch them? If we were a tariff beneficiary, we should not care whether our legal favors were given to us and continued to us by a party that was not committed to them, and would not defend them, or not. The only question we should ask would be, "Will the party secure us in the possession of our plunder?" As long as Secretary Shaw's party does that, the monopolists can afford to snap their fingers at such solemn talk as his in condemnation of an unfair tariff which, nevertheless, he asserts cannot be revised.

In such frankness of public speech as Mr. Shaw's there is, however, a great benefit. He is an unconsciously severe critic of the protective tariff. Almost naïvely, he exposes it as a system of confederated selfishness. By hook and by crook, by log-rolling and by bargaining, by promises and by threats, and by cash payments for value received, powerful interests succeed in writing into the tariff the particular legislative favors they most desire. Then they take their stand firmly on the principle, "honor among thieves." That is, they fight, tooth and nail, every attempt to abolish even a flagrant tariff injustice, on the ground of "one for all and all for one," since the whole system would be brought to the earth if any man's peculiar spoils were to be imperilled. Just that, in fact, is what Secretary Shaw means when he says that you cannot modify certain duties without bringing on a general revision. In each case, the alarmed and angry beneficiaries say, "Oh, you mean to take away my pet little protection, do you? Well, I want you to understand that if you touch a penny of my plunder, I will smash your whole tariff, do you hear?" Thereupon follow expressions such as Mr. Shaw's about the danger to "prosperity" of any "protracted debate" on a corrupt tariff, and the dividers of the spoil go off chuckling, in the certainty that the Republican party has again been frightened into doing nothing about the tariff.

How inevitably a protective tariff plays off one selfish interest against another, is shown in the Secretary's assertion that the Iowa farmers would favor no tariff revision that affected their products. This is probably correct. Protection has been educating the whole country to think of tariff taxation as a game of grab, and Iowa could not be expected to lag behind other States in this national school of selfishness. Into such narrow and inconsistent notions do we necessarily drive people when we make them think of taxes, not as a means of raising needed revenue, but as an ingenious method of taking money out of one man's pocket to put it in another's. But, fortunately, men's minds become opened to the injustice of this. We believe the Iowa farmers are astir about the tariff, not so much because they think it hurts them in pocket, as because they see in it a form of public inequity. This is the thing to make the Republican leaders quake. Let the people once come to perceive that tariff taxes are used as a means of class favoritism, of giving one man an unjust advantage over his neighbor, and of destroying that equality of all men before the law which is the breath of life in the nostrils of democracy, and they will find a sure and rapid road to tariff revision. If the Republican party plaintively urges that it would like to do the work and will, but only at the Greek Kalends, another party will speedily be put in power which will not only refuse to defend tariff injustices, but will rectify them.

The Idaho Republican State Convention met just after the Republican Secretary of the Treasury had informed the nation that there is no warrant for the theory adopted by the Iowa Republicans that the tariff may "shelter monopoly," and had argued that it is a bad thing to talk about revision because it is likely to "paralyze business." Yet the convention declared boldly and clearly for this policy, announcing that "we favor a revision of the tariff, without unreasonable delay, which will place upon the free list every article and product controlled by any monopoly, and such other articles and products as are beyond the need of protection"; and giving this reason for the demand—"that many of the industries of this country have outgrown their infancy, and the American manufacturer has entered the market of the world, and is successfully competing with the manufacturers of all other countries."

The Idaho Republicans did not adopt this clear-cut deliverance because they want to snub Secretary Shaw, or to break with such other party leaders in Congress as Representatives Grosvenor of Ohio and Cannon of Illinois and Senator Hanna of Ohio, who agree with the Secretary. They did it only because forced to do so in order to have any chance of carrying their State this year. Idaho, like other Rocky Mountain States, went for Bryan by a tremendous majority in 1896, his vote being 23,192 and McKinley's only 6,314; but by 1900 there had been such a readjustment of party lines in the larger population that, on a total poll nearly twice as large, Bryan's vote was only 29,414, while McKinley's rose to 27,198, and in the Congressional fight the Fusion nominee had a plurality of but 1,227 over the Republican candidate. As the tide appears to have continued running in favor of the Republicans since 1900, there should be a good chance of the party's carrying the State this year—provided it does not affront public sentiment. It was clear that the Democrats would advocate tariff revision, and there was nothing for the Republicans to do but commit their candidate for Congress (the State has only one Representative) to a radical position; so we have the thoroughgoing demand for revision, and even the open sneer at the "infant industry" humbug.

STICKING TO THE POINT.

Ashfield has built up for itself, during the many years that Professor Norton has gathered high-minded friends about him there, a peculiar name among Massachusetts towns. More truly than in former years to Marshfield or to Quincy, do the people look to it for a certain order of political deliverances. These are not in the direct line of party. They have not upon them the *cachet* of those holding great office. But they are the utterance of men to whom, as to William Penn, "it ought to be a part of a man's religion that his country shall be well governed," and who are ready with Lowell to give that supreme proof that they love their country—namely, that they loathe her shame. So it has been that voices at the Ashfield annual dinner have often been weighty with that higher statesmanship which compels the tardy obedience of statesmen. There Curtis spoke year after year. The politicians broke into their customary guffaws at his fantastic ideas of a reformed civil service, and the ephemera of the press buzzed about his head, just as they will about the men who addressed their countrymen at Ashfield on Thursday; but time showed that Curtis's fearless scrutiny of the present swayed the future, and so it may be with these fresh reminders of our shortcomings and of our duty in the Philippines.

The peculiar value of the Ashfield speeches of Messrs. Ehrich and Smith, and of Professor Norton himself, seems to us to lie in a sharp recalling of the people's attention to the main question:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is, not how we got into the Philippines, but what we are doing there, what is to be the aim and motive of our stay, and what the signal for our withdrawal. We must stick to the point. We must not allow ourselves to be confused by minor issues and side questions. The armed insurrection is put down; true, but what answer have we for the Filipinos who urgently ask what their present status is, and what their future fate is to be? It will not do to point them to our schools, to our measures of sanitation. Certainly they will not be reassured by being referred to the swarms of exploiters and concessionaires from the United States, who are seeking their lands and their forests, their mines and their franchises. All that we can point to with pride, all that we have to allude to with shame, in our administration of the islands, goes for nothing beside the main questions: "Do we mean to hold the inhabitants as purchased chattels? Are they citizens, or are they slaves? Is their right to free and independent self-government to be admitted or to be denied?"

There is much fallacious talk about keeping an "open mind" on this subject. "Let us wait and see; let us suspend judgment; let us advance step by step." But that, as John Morley said about the proposal to give Ireland home rule "step by step," is a mere phrase and nothing more. Step by step to what goal? That is the question. If we are stepping towards Filipino independence, we must know and declare that fact before we can move our feet intelligently. The end not simply crowns the work, but determines the work. This is elementary in human conduct. We must know what our end is, or else we cannot rightly choose our means. If every extension of local government in Ireland signifies a preparation for complete home rule, well and good. If, on the contrary, it means throwing a sop in a fright to agitators, it is statesmanship that will curse its victims, and surely return to plague its inventors. The same political philosophy applies to the Philippines. We cannot go forward, as the Republican party appears to desire to do, in a state of non-committal. It is either freedom or despotism that we are laboring for, and we must make up our minds which at the start, and stick to our single purpose all the way through.

It is said that the people have lost interest in the Philippine question. Well, if they have, it is a powerful argument for our leaving at the earliest day a place where we never should have gone. If we do not let the natives manage their own affairs, and refuse to be bothered with their government or their welfare ourselves, the demonstration of our unfitness for an Imperial career is complete. But a state of apparent indifference in public sentiment may mean much or little, may indicate one drift of opinion or quite another. One thing it surely does disprove, and that is the theory that there is any general and hearty acquiescence in the notion that this republic should set about governing over-sea colonies permanently after the fashion of an empire. That would be a mighty change in our standards and in our policy; and such a change, as Burke said, would surely be accompanied by many visible signs and by great and widespread popular agitation. But nothing of that sort is perceptible. If there is, as the Imperialists gleefully allege, seeming apathy about their Philippine venture, that is the last thing in the world on which they should congratulate themselves. They are proposing a radical departure, a sharp break with our past; and they ought, if they are to succeed, to be finding vivid interest and enthusiastic support among the people. Indifference means inertia; and it must not be forgotten that American inertia is wholly in favor of free men and independent government.

What we, for our part, see in the present quiescent state of the Philippine question is evidence that this matter is being worked out apart from the confusion of war and the violent strifes of party; that the people are still trusting, as Mr. Ehrich said, in the upright intentions, as well as in the hopeful words, of President Roosevelt; that they believe the American spirit of fair play and American principles will conquer in the end. Meanwhile, the patriotic attitude is one of vigilance, to seize upon every development of the problem as it presents itself, and press its teachings home; and of continued readiness to raise at every juncture the question that will not be put by: "Is our future to copy fair our past, or are we to impose upon others a yoke which we ourselves fought to shake off, and attempt to govern 8,000,000 men across the ocean without their consent?"

THE NEW BRITISH ACADEMY.

In order to understand the scope of the institution recently chartered by the English Crown, one has only to repeat its official style. The forty-nine scholars who last winter applied for a charter now constitute the British Academy for the Promotion of Historical, Philosophical, and Philological Studies; and each of these gentlemen is, we presume, entitled to write after his name, F.B.A.P.H.P.P.S.—a dignity which deprives their reported waiver of the title of "Immortals" of much of its merit. Mr. Herbert Spencer has probably found in this case more than usual justification for his habitual refusal of academic honors. The significant omission of the word literature from the name of this Academy, the specification of the studies which it desires to promote, the list of original fellows—all show very clearly that this new body is in no way comparable to the French Academy, but rather to the affiliated academies which make up the Institute of France.

In other words, the British Academy will make no pretension to literary authority, but, whatever its immediate ambitions may be, will very soon take on the usual functions of a learned society—namely, the fostering of research, the holding of stated meetings, the publication of transactions, etc. It is well to recognize at the outset—for there has been some confusion of mind about the matter—that the eminent historians, metaphysicians, and philologists who make up this body cannot in the nature of the case form a tribunal of taste. They have been chosen strictly from the point of view of their eminence as specialists, and not at all for their general reputation in the world of British culture. It is a fortunate chance that Mr. Balfour the theologian, Lord Rosebery the historian, and Sir Leslie Stephen the biographer, have also a place in literature; but this is accidental. Many of the members are mere names to the intelligent Englishman. Literary eminence has been severely disregarded in making up the roll of fellows, or we must have had at the very least Mr. Swinburne, Mr. Meredith, and Mr. Hardy, with a selection from Mr. Stephen Phillips, Mr. William Watson, and Mr. W. B. Yeats. The Academy as it stands represents very adequately the historical scholarship of the Empire, but is not likely to have any large influence upon the cultivated public at large.

It might well be asked, then, why the project has been the subject of so much general discussion. It is simply due to the expectation aroused by the word "Academy." These same gentlemen organizing a "Society" for the promotion of their chosen studies would have been an object neither of tender solicitude nor of invidious comment. But the word Academy, which we feel they used ill-advisedly, immediately recalled Matthew Arnold's plea for a literary authority, as well as the long and distinguished sway of the Académie Française. This was an expectation which the learned men who make up the British Academy cannot possibly fulfil, and there is even danger that some painful antiquary who has not been asked to join may disinter from Cotgrave's Dictionary the participle, '*Académié*. Besotted, puzzled or plundered with too much skill, or studying."

But the grievance against the new Academy is merely a verbal one. One may predict for it a very honorable career in the way of coördinating historical research and of setting higher standards for metaphysical and philological investigation. It should do something to break up the excessive provincialism and individualism of English scholarship. But all this is likely to be apart from the main currents of British activity. The grievance of those who desire to see a genu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ine British Academy is less with these gentlemen who have inadvertently borrowed the name, than with the English writer and the English reader who desire neither counsel nor guidance. From the middle of the seventeenth century to the present day the dream of setting up an Academy to put an end to literary anarchy in England has haunted certain superior minds, and literary anarchy has continued to prevail. When one recalls how easy it was for Richelieu to dragoon an unwilling club of literary men into the service of the state, and how cheerfully the authority of the French Academy was recognized from the first, and its purpose of assuming the control of the French language fully approved, then one gains some conception of the kind of national temperament that desires official warrant for its tastes, and authority for its intellectual recreations. This, we need hardly say, is not the British temperament.

That England would be the gainer by establishing, after the French precedent, an official aristocracy, or oligarchy, of letters, many have plausibly maintained. The history and present condition of such an institution in the field of the fine arts —the Royal Academy—does not, however, show that the English have the gift of this kind of regimentation, and many will learn with a certain relief that the Royal charter, just announced, creates merely a learned society of exceptional dignity, not in any proper sense a British Academy.

OPERATIC DIVISION OF LABOR.

Italian journals announced, not long ago, that the well-known Milanese music publisher, Sonzogno, had once more offered a big prize—$10,000—for the best one-act opera. Composers of all nationalities may compete, and while the libretto must be Italian, the addition of the German Humperdinck, the French Massenet, and the Belgian Jan Blockx to the list of judges guarantees that the music will not be regarded too much from the Italian point of view. Sonzogno's first competition, twelve years ago, resulted in the selection of "Cavalleria Rusticana," which, for a year or two, was sung more frequently than "Faust," "Carmen," or "Lohengrin," and carried Mascagni's fame to all parts of the world. On the strength of that triumph, he succeeded in securing the performance, on profitable terms, of half-a-dozen subsequent operas, though all of them proved failures. His engagement for a series of concerts and performances of his operas in this country, next autumn, is also, obviously, a consequence of his one success.

Generally speaking, the composing of music is about the least profitable business in which a human being can indulge. Financial success, indeed, means more even than it does in literature, but it is extremely rare. In Germany, during the last two or three decades, the only composers who have made anything worth mentioning out of their operas are Nessler, Brüll, Humperdinck, and perhaps Goldmark. Yet Germany has about seventy opera-houses, and dozens of new operas are tried on the public every year. In Italy the number of new works is as great, if not greater, and France also contributes a considerable number; yet a reasonably lasting addition to the European repertory is made only once or twice in a decade.

The question is often asked, "Why do not our American composers write grand operas?" The answer is: Because there is about as much encouragement for them as there would be if they wrote treatises on trigonometry in Anglo-Saxon or Sanskrit. One of our very best musicians, Professor Paine of Harvard, spent about ten years in writing the libretto and the music of an opera. Perusal of the vocal score shows that it is an excellent work—far better than nine-tenths of the operatic novelties. Yet there is no possibility of getting it produced in America, France, or Italy. In Germany there is a possibility, but very little probability. Some years ago, Eugene D'Albert, famous both as pianist and composer, complained in a Leipzig music journal that even well-known musicians seldom succeed in getting their operas on the stage unless they are willing to pay $5,000 or more out of their own pockets. There are numberless difficulties to surmount, chief among which are the disinclination of famous singers to spend time on a work which may have only two or three performances, and the unwillingness of managers to buy a sumptuous scenic outfit for an opera which is almost sure to prove as unprofitable as its predecessors.

Such is the discouraging situation. A ray of light, however, has suddenly come from what seemed at first a mere calamity. When the Stuttgart Opera-house burned down, a few months ago, the singers and players were confronted with the alternative of taking a long vacation, which they could not afford, or going on the road. They chose the latter. In the United States a travelling opera company is an annual phenomenon. In Germany it was a novelty, which had only one notable precursor —the Neumann-Seidl performances of the Nibelung Tetralogy after the first Bayreuth Festival. But the Stuttgarters pursued a very different policy from Mr. Grau's. When our Metropolitan Opera-house company travels, it limits its repertory to six or eight of the most familiar popular operas. With such a policy the Stuttgarters would have come to grief, for the popular operas are in each German city "worked for all they are worth" by the local manager. Therefore they tried an experiment. Their repertory included certain new operas which had not yet been produced generally. The Berliners, for instance, had not heard "Orestes," although its composer, Weingärtner, is one of the most prominent musicians in that city; nor had the opera-goers of Munich had a chance of hearing "Lobetanz," by their gifted fellow-citizen, Ludwig Thuille. By producing these operas in the Prussian and Bavarian capitals respectively, the Stuttgarters insured abundant newspaper notice, and greatly increased the interest in their visit, as well as their profits.

This experiment suggests a reform of the whole operatic situation. Why should there not be a division of labor in the production of operas, as in every other business that aims at success? Why should not each company learn five or six new operas every year and, after singing them a few times at home, visit other cities and give them there? This would obviate the necessity of rehearsing the same untried opera in several cities, and would effect a great saving in the expenditures on scenery. It would, no doubt, happen frequently that operas which had aroused only a languid interest in one city would in another enjoy a brilliant success, and this would react on the home audience and cause it to revise its verdict. This was the case even with two such master-works as "Carmen" and "Faust," and there is excellent reason for believing that other fine operas have been lost to the world because no such opportunity was given for revising a first hasty verdict. In any case, if managers could produce their novelties in half-a-dozen or a dozen different cities, they would be sure to get back the money invested in them, and this would make them more willing to try new operas, whereby the composers and the public also would be benefited. Such a plan, to be sure, could be followed only in countries like Germany, France, and Italy, where there are many opera-houses in cities not too far apart. But in the end American composers, too, would be benefited, because the demand for new operas would be greatly increased, and if an American opera should win a brilliant success in a dozen foreign cities, Mr. Grau would, no doubt, be glad to produce it at the Metropolitan Opera-house and take it on the road as far as San Francisco.

MONTALEMBERT'S LETTERS.

PARIS, August. 12, 1902.

The agitation going on in France at the present moment on the subject of the execution of a recent law on the religious congregations, lends unusual interest to a correspondence of Montalembert's which has just been published. Montalembert was among the first apostles of the liberty of teaching, as opposed to what was once a monopoly of the University created by Napoleon. Together with Lacordaire and La-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mennais, he founded in 1830 a Catholic organ, *L'Avenir*, which had extraordinary success. It took for its device "God and Liberty"; its aim was to reconcile Catholicism with democracy. It went so far as to demand the separation of Church and State in order to secure complete independence for the Church. Some of its doctrines frightened the bishops, who felt themselves sufficiently protected by the Concordat signed by Napoleon and the Pope. They brought some of the doctrines of the *Avenir* before Gregory XVI. Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert went in person to Rome to defend themselves; after some delays, the journal was condemned and disappeared in 1832.

Montalembert's reputation was made. Although he bowed before the decision of Rome, he continued to defend such doctrines of the *Avenir* as had not been specifically condemned, and chiefly engaged in the defence of the liberty of teaching, which he believed to be one of the "necessary liberties," to use an expression of Thiers. We find, in a letter written on the 8th of April, 1839, to a friend of his, the Abbé Delor:

"The liberty of teaching which so justly preoccupies you is the object of my constant wishes; under its banner I entered public life when I had hardly emerged from infancy [Montalembert entered the House of Peers when he came of age], and I will never desert it. But I have little hope as long as the bishops, the clergy, and the Catholic heads of families follow the present system—that is to say, as long as they keep aloof, isolated from the social movement and the political habits of the country, expecting the return of an order of things which I believe is gone for ever, instead of descending into the arena. . . . There is nothing to hope. The Government will maintain a monopoly which it thinks precious; false liberalism will not claim a liberty which would be profitable only to Catholicism, and the isolated voice of a few royalistic Peers or Deputies will be lost in the storm of egoistic and noisy passions which dominate the Chambers. The question of the liberty of teaching is entirely in the hands of the bishops."

The Abbé Delor, to whom this letter was addressed, lived at Limoges; he died only in 1899, at the age of ninety years. The letters which Montalembert addressed to him during a long period have just been published. In 1841, M. Villemain, who was then Minister of Public Instruction, presented to the Chambers an Education bill. It authorized the opening of free schools, independent of the University, under certain guarantees of culture and morality. The masters were to have diplomas, conferred after examination. The law applied to the seminaries where the young priests were educated and were so far under the control solely of the bishops. This last clause provoked the opposition of the episcopate, and, after long discussions, the bill was withdrawn. Montalembert took a prominent part in the discussion, and his letters to the Abbé Delor bear traces of it. We also find allusions to an affair which made much noise in 1844. A certain Mademoiselle C——— of Tulle had entered a Carmelite convent against the will of her parents. The municipal council asked the Government to close the convent, and the Prefect of the Corrèze was inclined to use violence and to disperse the Carmelites forcibly. The Bishop, Monseigneur Berteaud, wrote to the Minister of the Interior, Martin du Nord: "You have the power to do so; but the doors will not open themselves—you will have to break them in, and you will find me behind them in my sacerdotal robes."

Montalembert was Deputy after the Revolution of 1848. Under the Republic, as under the monarchy, he remained at the head of the party which placed religious interests above political. He writes to his friend: "The Catholics, like all other Frenchmen, adore success. After having saluted, with a haste as servile as it is inexplicable, the advent of the Republic, many are tempted to look with distrust on the soldier who, faithful to his device and to his habit, tells the truth to the new powers as he spoke it to the fallen powers, without fear and without hope." He had not identified religion with royalty; he no more wished to identify it with democracy.

M. de Montalembert took a very active part in the discussion of the law still known under the name of "the Falloux law," from the Minister who proposed it. It established freedom of secondary instruction. The Catholic paper, the *Univers*, attacked M. de Falloux's bill, which the editor, Louis Veuillot, did not consider of a nature to satisfy the Catholics completely. From that date there arose a constant state of opposition between Montalembert and Veuillot. Montalembert represented what may be called the liberal wing of the Catholic party; Veuillot was hostile to all liberalism. In 1852 Montalembert wrote to his friend:

"I have remained what I was, the humble soldier of the Church, but also the firm friend of Liberty. It is under her shield and that of Truth that I have so resolutely struggled since 1847 against the wretches who, under cover of her name, have propagated the democratic and social revolution. But now I see that the Catholics who follow the *Univers* don't want any more of Liberty, which has helped them to so many successes [the Falloux law]; they bow to force and victory. . . . I want to remain erect, and I have ceased to be the man of the present movement."

By this he means the reaction which culminated in the establishment of the Empire. Montalembert did not refuse support to Prince Louis Napoleon when he was elected by the vote of the people; he hoped to enlist him among the supporters of his views. The Prince had seen him many times, and had given him hopes which were bitterly disappointed. The anger of Montalembert, who was of a very passionate disposition, was equal to the sympathy which he had felt for a time. He is very bitter, after the proclamation of the Empire, against "the mean Catholics who burned their incense before Liberty, when they believed her triumphant, and who now sacrifice her without remorse or embarrassment to the new influences and to the fashion of the day." He speaks of himself as "shipwrecked."

Montalembert, thus hostile to the Empire, was in opposition to L. Veuillot, who continued to support the Empire till the Italian policy of Napoleon alarmed him for the temporal power of the Papacy. The Catholic world was divided till the Roman question was opened. In 1860 the Romagna was detached from the States of the Church, and some French bishops, who had long been silent, entered a protest against this curtailing of the Papal territory. Montalembert applauded their efforts loudly.

"Nantes," said he, "Poitiers and Perpignan [meaning the bishops of these towns], and others, have been admirable. They have said things which cannot be surpassed; but the accent of Tulle has been supplied by nobody else. A little thunder and lightning was necessary. . . . I am in anguish, in desolation, in all the bitterness of powerless wrath; what despicable blindness everywhere! I long thought that when their houses should burn, people would see. They are burning, and people won't see."

The houses did burn, and the temporal power found few defenders. In 1860 Montalembert asked M. de Persigny for permission to found a paper, in which he meant to defend the temporal power; but it was refused. "The Minister," he said, "tried to reassure me as to the designs of the Government; he did not succeed—far from it. How ignorant they are, how blinded by pride, how entangled in their own nets!"

Montalembert wrote a curious letter to his friend the Abbé Delor, who had expressed to him the hope of seeing some day on the throne in France a friend of the Church of Rome:

"You see the salvation of the Church and of society in I don't know what kind of orthodox Cæsar. This dream is completely foreign to the spirit which presided over the Catholic movement of 1830 and of 1850—a liberal spirit to which I remained faithful, and which will not seek in Utopias for the solution of present difficulties. I know in the history of France but two orthodox Cæsars, Charlemagne and Cæsar. Charlemagne left behind him only the pitiful race of the Carlovingians, reduced to a happy impotence by the liberal spirit of the Germanic races: Saint Louis had for his grandson Philippe le Bel, whose fatal germ survived in all his successors."

In 1863, Montalembert was a candidate for the Legislature, but he was attacked by the Government and defeated. He had stood only with reluctance, and he writes to his friend: "I have encountered so much treachery and meanness in contemporary France, especially among the Catholics, that I have no great desire to enter again into public life." He adds: "I should like enlightened and sincere priests like yourself to ask themselves, How is it that the French clergy, which, in 1848 and 1849, succeeded in having 180 Catholic Representatives elected, could not have a single one in 1863? How are we to explain this incredible political and social diminution of influence?" He attributes it himself to the set of Catholic journalists whose tactics have set the nation against them. He denounces their defamation of the vanquished and the weak, their adulation of the strong, their constant and systematic denunciation and proscription of reason and of liberty. He has eloquent words against the influence exercised over the clergy of France by the Catholic press proclaiming itself the only interpreter of Catholic truth.

These letters of Montalembert's deserve to be read, and I have read them with melancholy; the past throws its light over the present, and the present has much to learn from the past.

Correspondence.

THE STUDY OF HISTORY IN THE SOUTH.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Dr. Dodd has done a real service to the South in showing how greatly the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teaching of history has been neglected there. His statement may surprise many people, but it is not materially erroneous. It would perhaps be valuable if the discussion were carried further and the whole subject given a thorough examination. Many Southerners would be glad to see such a discussion, and it could not fail to bring up in a variety of views much real truth.

The South has had too few of the benefits of full discussion. The fathers of most of us were Confederate soldiers, but that does not mean that we ought to believe that their political views were correct. The mere acceptance of their views as an act of loyalty stands for an impoverished state of thought on the part of the children. Tradition weakens thought. If the *Nation* can, therefore, make itself a means of bringing out counter opinions on this subject, it will deserve the thanks of all right-minded people. It will also strengthen the group of independent investigators to which Dr. Dodd has referred.

The most conservative force in Southern history is the politician. In this part of the Union he has always had great influence. He dominated most phases of thought. It has suited his purposes to glorify the men of the past and to flatter those of the present. He has created in the popular mind an unreal historical spirit. He is not necessarily insincere. He got his views of history in the same school in which he has taught them, and they frequently seem to be honestly held. But whether he is sincere or not, he is sagacious enough to see that if, through independent historical research, men should come to modify their views of politics, his own chances of success would be lessened. He has, therefore, defended the old ideas. Any attempt to introduce new notions will arouse his opposition; and his influence is such over public opinion that conditions may become very uncomfortable for the apostles of new ideas.

This condition of affairs has a vital relation to Southern institutions of learning. Most of these institutions depend for their success directly on public opinion. They must have either legislative appropriations, or popular contributions, or tuition fees. They are, accordingly, very prone to be conservative. It suits them to have history taught in a colorless and nerveless manner. The real secret of the spirit of independence at Trinity College is the fact that it has received liberal donations of equipment and endowment, and is liberated from the power of existing public opinion. It has thus been able to take its own course and to develop a new spirit in its own community. Other institutions will doubtless do the same thing as soon as they are financially able.—Very truly,

JOHN S. BASSETT.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DURHAM, N. C.,
August 23, 1902.

MARGARET FULLER AND "THE DIAL."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you kindly pardon me for giving you a little word of information? In your paper of August 7 you have an article on that book of Thoreau which has lately been published. You say something about Margaret Fuller, "then one of the editors of the *Dial*," and about Emerson as the associate editor. Now, by reference to T. W. Higginson, Kenyon West, and others who have written about Margaret Fuller, as well as by reference to the biographies by Clarke, Channing, and Emerson, you will see that, during the four years of the *Dial's* existence, Margaret Fuller was its only editor for two years. She was its first editor, receiving no help from Emerson except as he was contributor, the same as Alcott and others. When she finally gave up the editing, it was because she had been overtaxed, had many burdens, and had received no pay. We must be just to the memory of the noblest woman of letters that America has yet produced.—Sincerely yours,

F. L. H.

DARK HARBOR, ME., August 17, 1902.

PROPERTY IN LETTERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have recently had my attention called to what is perhaps an isolated case of a breach of academic ethics, and one which is not, I hope, likely to become general.

The case is that of a young man who was an unsuccessful candidate for an academic appointment in one of the larger universities. He sent in with his application such testimonials as to character and ability as he had himself received from friends and instructors, and requested others to write to the President of the university direct in his behalf. In such cases the candidate is entitled to receive again all the papers he has sent in, but in this case—and here comes my point—he received not only his own letters, but those addressed to the university President in his behalf. Perhaps the notion that a letter is the private and exclusive property of the one to whom it is addressed *and the writer of the letter*, is old-fashioned and out of date, but all honor to those who believe they have no right to make public the contents of a letter without the consent of the writer.—Most truly yours,

LOUIS N. WILSON, Librarian.

CLARK UNIVERSITY, WORCESTER, MASS.,
August 15, 1902.

THE "SWEAT BOX."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a Chicago paper of recent date we read:

"The attempt to wring a confession from the prisoner by putting him in the 'sweat box,' it is expected, will result," etc.

And again:

"The prisoner has become almost a physical wreck under the 'sweat box' ordeal, and appears as if he might break down at any time."

Much outcry is being made, and justly, against the cruelty and barbarism of the "water cure" and other atrocities practised by our army upon the benighted Filipinos; yet here at home, in our own Christian land, under the shadow of church spires and university domes, we tolerate the unlawful and inhuman custom of torturing persons arrested on suspicion of being principals in or accessories to a crime. This torture is inflicted without sanction or authority of law, and in conflict with all Constitutional rights and guaranties. It is done for the purpose of extorting confessions of guilt from the suspected persons. As "no person shall be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself," these extorted confessions cannot be used as evidence against him. The ruse is, however, to introduce them as "voluntary" confessions; and thus, by an abuse of authority and disregard for law and right, by means of duress and torture, a prisoner under the law is forced to renounce the protection of the law, and, contrary to his constitutional right, is compelled to give incriminating testimony against himself.

And by whom is this illegal process conducted? By the most petty and subordinate officers of the law—policemen and jailors; men whose only recommendation to the offices they hold is, frequently, their brutality. What right have these men to "try" or in any way interfere with prisoners? The person held by them is entitled to "a trial by jury," and what man can deprive him of that right? The duty of a policeman is merely to bring the person "by lawful authority" into the custody of the law; and a jailor's business is to "keep him safely" until a "speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury," shall be had.

As you would abolish lynch law and all other relics of barbarism from our system of jurisprudence, I beg of you to help abolish also the unlawful, inhuman physical tortures administered by means of the "sweat box" or "third degree."

MARGARET IRVING HAMILTON.

AUGUST 16, 1902

Notes.

Fisher Unwin will soon bring out 'Lombard Studies,' by Countess Evelyn Martinengo Cesaresco, whose 'Italian Characters,' 'The Liberation of Italy,' and 'Cavour' are well known.

Thomas Whittaker's autumn list will embrace 'Makers of Modern Fiction,' by W. J. Dawson; 'Cameos from Nature,' by Mrs. J. T. Gumersall; 'The Church and its Social Mission,' by Dr. J. Marshall Lang, Principal of the University of Aberdeen; 'The Story of Catherine of Siena,' by Florence Witts; 'Up and Down the Pantiles,' by Emma Marshall; and a 'Robert Browning Birthday Book.'

From Scribners we are to have a posthumous volume from the pen of Frank R. Stockton, 'John Gayther's Garden and the Stories Told Therein'; and 'Views and Reviews, Essays in Appreciation—Art,' by W. E. Henley.

'Recollections of a Player,' by James H. Stoddart, is in the press of the Century Co., together with a Bible for children edited by the Rev. Francis Brown, D.D., of the Union Theological Seminary.

The Outlook Co. are to publish 'The Tragedy of Pelée,' by George Kennan, illustrated.

'The Philosophy of Despair,' the reply of Science to pessimism, by President David Starr Jordan, is announced by Elder & Shepard, San Francisco.

The Baker & Taylor Co. have in preparation a compilation of coffee history, coffee anecdote, and coffee verse, by Arthur H. Gray, with "recipes for the making of coffee from the leading chefs of the country."

We have received from the office of the *Publishers' Weekly* the two volumes of the 'Reference Catalogue of Current Literature,' the British analogue of our 'American

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trade List Annual'—*i. e.*, a congeries of publishers' catalogues bound together and indexed. It is needless to say more, yet the bulk of this issue is notably greater than that of 1898. Every library and every enterprising bookseller needs this tool.

'Our Literary Deluge' seems an odd title for a book condemning the multiplication of books, especially when made up of transient articles which have already seen the light in various periodicals (Doubleday, Page & Co.). The author, Francis W. Halsey, has a chapter on "Biographies that are Histories," in which his measure of comparison is Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall.' That a single life covering the Scriptural age of man should require two-thirds as many words as Gibbon's twelve centuries of the civilized world's history, is made to appear monstrous; but what of a voluminous historical novel like 'War and Peace' covering only five or six years? And may not mercy be craved for a single work, itself an historical source, and final for its subject, by contrast with dribbling biography like that welcomed for Stevenson, Ruskin, Rossetti, or Carlyle, or with dribbling history like that of the Oxford Movement? Mr. Halsey's time-and-space standard would lead to a *reductio ad absurdum*. Each age demands great fulness for its own history, and cannot dispense with it. Not that biographers must not be called and strictly held to account; but there may be volume without prolixity and without padding, and where there is controversy in the subject there must be volume if the rectification is documentary.

The Chetham Society of Manchester, in publishing the "Remains, Historical and Literary, connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester," arrives in its forty-sixth volume at the 'Portmote or Court Leet Records of the Borough or Town and Royal Manor of Salford' (1597-1669). These have been laboriously and conscientiously transcribed by J. G. de T. Mandley, and in the present (first) volume come down to April 18, 1632. The matter is monotonous enough, but pictures effectively the habits of the time—dunghills and middens out of place, foul drains, unringed swine, unmuzzled "mastiths," untrimmed hedges, neglected pavements, tippling, scolding, "carding," broils and tusslements, receiving strangers of doubtful solvency, etc. The proper names of persons will attract the genealogist. Of more or less frequent occurrence are Higginson, Mather, Bancroft, Parkhurst, Radcliffe, Pendleton, Bolton, Holden, Mosley, Nugent, Burgess, Pilkington, Hutchinson, Blagden, Holland, Percival, Hollins, Beck, Worrall, Bowker. The laxity of government is shown in the number of old offenders against sanitary and other ordinances. Needless to add that odd spellings and strange terms for the antiquarian abound.

The little 'Onward and Upward: A Book for Boys and Girls [from ten to fourteen],' by Hugh H. Quilter, B.A. (Oxon.), of which Sonnenschein and Dutton are the respective London and New York publishers, is noticeable chiefly as an unsectarian contribution to popular education at a time when the sectarian features of the Education Bill are exciting so much contention in England. Morality is sought to be inculcated without supernatural sanction, through the medium of natural history and a comparison of "human beings with other members of the animal world." We think the author has not done justice to the moral evolution of the brute creation. He has also raised without firmly satisfying questionings about the use of animal food, and of animal pelage for clothing and ornament, and about the keeping of animals in confinement. Mr. Quilter frowns on menageries.

'Registering of Title to Land,' by Jacques Dumas, Procureur de la République at Rethel, France (Chicago: Callaghan & Co.), is a series of five lectures delivered before the law department of Yale University in April, 1900. The Storrs Lecturer of that year was a French magistrate who has won distinction by some scholarly works on problems of landed property. The system of registering title which he describes is quite recent in this country, having been adopted by only three States—Illinois, Ohio, and Massachusetts. In this book, which practically repeats the lectures, one need not look for any new facts on the system of registering title; but the student of law, as well as the general reader who has heard of the Torrens Act and is interested in these matters, will find in Mr. Dumas's work a clear and entertaining exposition of the systems of registering title in various countries. The book, which was written in English by a foreigner, has not suffered from that fact. It reads well, and has the French quality of clearness, and the dry recital of facts is enlivened by some of those "idées générales" of which the French are so fond.

The fifth volume of Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society (Oxford, Miss.) is notable as a survey, required by law, of the materials relating to the history of the State from the earliest times. It has been edited by Dr. Franklin L. Riley, Chairman of the Historical Commission appointed *ad hoc*. It contains calendars of collections of books, newspapers (even to loose copies), and manuscripts (see the valuable section entitled "An account of manuscripts, papers, and documents in private hands"), and devotes nearly eighty pages to extinct towns and villages. The small Indian tribes of the State are commemorated. The negro cuts no figure here. The "collectors and students" whose specialties are enumerated at pp. 269-286 pass him wholly by. Shall we infer that this people which "has no history" is therefore happy, according to the proverb? The "Mississippi plan" and Reconstruction are equally ignored by collectors.

Slavery is the opening subject in the seventh volume of Transactions of the Kansas State Historical Society (Topeka). The President tells of "The Passing of Slavery in Western Missouri." C. E. Cory answers the question: "Were there ever slaves in Kansas?" John Brown, of course, makes a frequent appearance in these 600 pages. The Society has one large volume of his personal letters "concerning his actions in Kansas and at Harper's Ferry." That he had any association with Quantrill is denied in the paper on "The Early Life of Quantrill in Kansas." A sketch of the life of Col. Richard J. Hinton is furnished by William E. Connelley. We remark also a chapter on Lincoln in Kansas in December, 1859. His first speech was made on the eve of Brown's execution. He could not approve of the Harper's Ferry raid, or of any but a peaceful anti-slavery propaganda; but "John Brown has shown great courage, rare unselfishness, as Governor Wise testifies." Among Lincoln's notes for his Kansas speeches is this interesting one: "Last year Gov. Seward and myself, at different times and occasions, expressed the opinion that slavery is a durable element of discord, and that we shall not have peace with it until it either masters or is mastered by the free principle." At pages 472-486 will be found explanations of the origin of county and city names in Kansas.

The second volume of the seventh series of the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston) offers a third portion of the Trumbull papers in its archives, from 1777 to the peace of 1783. Letters *to* Jonathan Trumbull predominate. The scarcity of bread and provisions in Plymouth, Newport, and Nantucket in 1779 is noticeable among the topics of this correspondence, and for want of flour Yale College, as President Stiles writes, had to be prorogued. Roger Sherman's use of a singular verb with the subject "Congress" is contrary to the prevailing use: Congress . . . they, writes Silas Deane; Congress seem, writes Henry Laurens; Congress are, writes Titus Hosmer. The index to this volume leaves much to be desired.

The current issue of the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* contains some interesting personalia, not the least important among these being fresh confirmation of the fact that, in 1772, the doctor dissertation of Goethe was refused by the faculty of the University of Strassburg, chiefly for religious reasons. Two letters to this effect from Professor Staeber had been known, in which some doubt was expressed as to the complete sanity of young Goethe, and the statement was made that the dissertation had been suppressed by the law faculty *ex capite religionis et prudentiæ*. The new evidence is found in a hitherto unpublished letter of Doctor Medicinæ Metzger, dated August 7, 1771, which states that student Goethe, reputed to have been diligent in his work in Göttingen and Leipzig, had in Strassburg (having been thoroughly saturated with the wickedness of Monsieur Voltaire) defended the thesis "Jesus auctor et judex sacrorum," in which the proposition was maintained that Jesus Christ was not the author of the Christian religion, but that this system had been contrived by a number of wise men and then ascribed to the Nazarene. Metzger further states that the University authorities had refused to give Goethe permission to print this heretical dissertation.

Among the historical manuscripts published in the August Bulletin of the Boston Public Library is a report by Wait Winthrop of a committee appointed to consider the affairs of the Free Grammar School of Boston in 1710. He recommends the appointment of Inspectors, "Gentlemen, of Liberal Education, Together with some of the Revd. Ministers of the Town. . . . At their said Visitation, One of the Ministers, by turn's, to pray with the Schollars, and Entertain 'em with some Instructions of Piety, specially adapted to their age and Education." It is interesting to note that in a license for a tavern on the "Isles of Sholes," dated 1684, it is specially stipulated that the keeper "shall well behave himself. . . . without suffering unlawful games or meetings or other disorders, & without selling any strong liquour to any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indian whatever; & that he shall put in every barrell he shall brew two bushels of good malt." There is also a detailed description of the impressment, in 1758, by British soldiers, of a servant of Thomas Dawes on his return from Evening School.

The Quarterly Statement for July of the Palestine Exploration Fund announces the beginning of the excavation of Tell Jezar. This is the site of the Philistine town Gezer, one of the few places whose continuous life connects prehistoric times with our own days. Three of the tablets found at Tell el-Amarna were from the governor of this town begging for assistance to put down a rebellion. A Pharaoh burned it and gave the site to his daughter, the wife of Solomon, who rebuilt it; and here Saladin encamped during his negotiations with Richard Cœur de Lion. Hopes are entertained that the excavation will throw light not only upon Biblical problems—as, for instance, whether this Pharaoh was an Egyptian king or a ruler of the North Arabian land of Musur—but also upon the nature and extent of Mycenæan influence on Palestinian culture, and upon the ethnological affinities of the Philistines and other coast dwellers. Among the other contents are remarks by Sir C. W. Wilson on the topography of Jerusalem at the time of Christ, with a plan, and some notes by Professor Clermont-Ganneau, in which he describes the fragment of a slab with a Greek inscription, an official document that apparently contained "valuable details regarding the geography and administrative organization of Palestine." An interesting side light is cast on the life of a small town by the discovery of some forty stones inscribed with imprecatory prayers. Mr. Macalister, who is in charge of the work at Gezer, deplores the fact that a "syndicate of fellahin, peddlers, and tourists are rapidly making Palestine archæologically a desert."

M. Brunetière writes in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for August 1 on the "Error of the Eighteenth Century," and protests against the belief "that the moral question is a social question." As an historical essay the article is interesting, even though the reader's tranquillity be occasionally ruffled by the critic's method and ultra-conservatism. Admitting that morals (*la morale*) cannot properly be subordinated to social utility, we fail to see consistency in Brunetière's statements, on the one hand, that morals are absolute and can be conceived of only *sub specie æternitatis*, and, on the other, that "their character of eternity is no more opposed to their progress than the immutability of the laws of nature is opposed to the progress of science"—unless we may understand that morals vary with time and place, which M. Brunetière denies. "C'est une mauvaise plaisanterie que de dire que, selon les temps et les lieux, les mêmes actions ont été diversement jugées." We fear there is some hair-splitting in these arguments, but recommend the article to students of moral science.

For four years now the great French Language Association called Alliance Français has been conducting annual " vacation courses" on a large scale, through which foreigners have had the opportunity of perfecting themselves in the French language and literature. At the end of each season a commission, consisting of university professors, examines the students and gives them their *diplômes de capacité*. The ordinary testimonial is given to those who have acquired the ability to speak and write the language thoroughly, while a higher certificate makes the recipient eligible to the position of a teacher of French abroad. The courses are open to all natives and foreigners. Not only are they being held this year during the two summer months in Paris, but also in Bordeaux, Nancy, Luc-sur-Mer, Caen, and Lyons. They are immensely popular, last year's enrolment containing 208 German, 74 American, 50 English, 149 Russian, and other foreign names. During the present year the courses are in charge of Professor Brunot of the Sorbonne and Professor Huguet of Caen, who act under the direction of a counsellor of the French Academy. Prominent teachers of languages from the universities and lycées constitute the teaching force of these vacation schools.

A correspondent reminds us, apropos of the statement in our Paris letter last week that Lauzun died at Montrouge (his country seat) on January 1, 1794, that he really perished by the guillotine in Paris and on December 31, 1793.

—The Editor's Study, in the September *Harper's*, continues its interesting confession as to editorial ideals and policies, recurring to the question of organic unity of contents, which had been considered in the July number. We do not yet find any very clear definition of the unifying principle, and can hardly conceive of any considerable number of readers with a culture broad and deep enough to have a relish for each and every one of the viands provided for the *Harper's* monthly banquet, and to assign to each its fitting place in a unified scheme of intellectual dietetics. We get, however, some interesting principles of exclusion. Banishing from the start partisan politics and subjects of religious or sectarian division, closing the bars at a later date against a class of special educational literature abundantly provided elsewhere, it has now become the editorial policy of this magazine to exclude the "timely" article also. Attention is specially called to the fact that it is the one magazine which has had nothing to say during the past few months concerning volcanoes or Edward VII. It would be no loss to the cause of letters if this determination to avoid the special province of the newspaper should prove contagious. In the realm of science all questions of practical application and commercial interest are tabooed. With these exclusions the editor considers that his magazine will henceforth be more free for its proper scope—"for its appeal to the most essential interests of that culture from which it is itself nourished." As to the brevity of its average article, to which we called attention two months ago, the editor disclaims any arbitrary curtailment, but holds that the newspapers and reviews have relieved the monthly magazine of its obligation to provide elaborately complete articles on subjects of weighty concern. Mr. Howells, in the Easy Chair, discusses the results of his inquiry of last spring as to whether poetry is still read and loved as of old. Only seven letters of reply were received, but these were all favorable to the muse, and the editorial comment is decidedly hopeful.

—Robert T. Hill and Prof. Israel C. Russell continue in the September *Century* the discussion of the recent West India volcanic eruptions. The difficulty of arriving at demonstrable truth in such a matter is seen in the varying conclusions of these two expert geologists as to the essential character of the destruction of Martinique. Dr. Hill regards the evidence as practically establishing the fact of a terrific aerial explosion within the cloud after it had erupted from the mountain. While no proof of the composition of the gases causing this explosion is as yet available, he thinks it likely that "either sulphuretted hydrogen or sulphur dioxid was criminally implicated." He leans strongly to the hypothesis that there were two clouds erupted; one, from the summit, floating southward horizontally, and developing violent electric discharges, the other bursting from some clogged-up ancient vent at a point lower down, and carrying with it a heavy load of gases, which this closed vent had held in confinement. The electric discharges passing from the upper cloud into the lower, he thinks, would have produced just such effects as are actually found in the ruins. Professor Russell, on the other hand, attributes the death of the people of Martinique to the inhalation of dust-laden steam, and regards the appearance of the dead bodies as inconsistent with the supposition that they were exposed to a blast of burning gases at any time during the eruption. Sylvester Baxter continues the subject of civic improvement, devoting his attention to streets and highways. The famous Long Meadow Street of the Connecticut valley, the Beacon Street boulevard of Brookline, Grove Street of Medford, and the Essex Woods Road near Manchester-by-the-Sea, are among the successful efforts at improvement cited and described. The article is full of good practical suggestions, and, at a time when improvement is in the air and money plenty, it ought to contribute to important material results.

—As a rule, the presumption is strong against a new text-book, and still stronger against a new grammar for use in schools. To change old formulas is dangerous for the pupil, and inconvenient for the teacher; to change references is a vexation. But the Doctor of Philosophy is not permitted to be mute and inglorious; it is his destiny to publish, and to treat afresh old matter which may have been better treated before by a much abler and better scholar. He must, therefore, "dree his weird," and he must not be held too closely to account for the doom of necessity. It is a pleasure to be able to add that these remarks do not apply to 'A Grammar of Attic and Ionic Greek,' by Prof. Frank Cole Babbitt (American Book Co.). This little book is well worthy of being associated with the memory of the eminent scholar, Prof. F. D. Allen, to whom it is dedicated, and by whose advice it was undertaken. About fifty pages were actually accomplished with his collaboration; the credit of the remainder belongs entirely to Dr. Babbitt. The general aim of the book is to include all the essentials for work in school or college. Attic forms and Attic syntax are presented in the body of the work; Ionic forms and Homeric syntax are given in smaller type at the foot of each page. The same mode of distinction is carried out in the list of irregular verbs, and the result is to impart constantly to the learner a very clear concep-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the difference between Attic and Homeric forms and usage. The latest researches in philology and in textual criticism are also applied in a conservative manner so as to help the memory rather than burden it; and the pupil is introduced to historical syntax just so far as it is calculated to clear up the usage of the language and to aid his mastery of principles. The classification and treatment of the subject of syntax is particularly luminous; it is in some respects novel and original, and brings light and order to a very complex subject. Explanations are frequently added of anomalies or of syntactical phenomena, such as the teacher himself might give (and sometimes does give), but which the pupil is constantly liable to forget. Every device of typography has been ingeniously employed to clarify the presentation of the facts. As a working manual, the many merits of this book and its brief compass should commend it to the serious attention of teachers.

—The 'Companion to English History (Middle Ages),' which is edited by Mr. Francis Pierrepont Barnard (H. Frowde), is a book to be most heartily commended both for its main idea and for its execution. What the "source-book" would fain do in one direction, this volume aims at accomplishing in another. We do not mean to say that the editor suggests such a comparison, but in both cases there is the same purpose of securing thoroughness and at the same time of arousing interest. What manner of work the 'Companion' is may best be gathered from a synopsis of its contents. To speak briefly, it is a series of separate essays on subjects connected with the social, domestic, intellectual, artistic, and commercial life of England during the Middle Ages. Architecture comes first in the scheme of arrangement and bulks largest in respect to space. Ecclesiastical Architecture is treated by the Rev. Arthur Galton; Domestic Architecture by Mr. J. A. Gotch; and Military Architecture by Mr. C. W. C. Oman. The other sections and authors are as follows: Costume (Mr. A. Hartshorne), Heraldry (Mr. F. P. Barnard), Shipping (Mr. M. Oppenheim), Town Life (Miss Lucy Toulmin-Smith); Country Life (Mr. G. P. Warner); Monasticism (Rev. Augustus Jessopp); Trade and Commerce (Mr. I. S. Leadam); Learning and Education (Mr. R. S. Rait); Art (Mr. G. McN. Rushforth). The average length of a section is about thirty pages, and there are nearly a hundred illustrations. What a help this book will be to teachers in the higher schools and in colleges of almost every degree will be apprehended at a glance by every one who has the least experience in such matters. Every topic, with the possible exception of heraldry, is of high consequence, and it might be contended that, as a factor in a book of this kind, heraldry is the most important of all, because its rules and conventions are so little understood by people at large. In two ways especially is a connected series of articles like this notable and admirable. Apart from the fact that the contributors are experts, a large amount of rich material is turned into appropriate form, and placed within easy reach of those who can make use of it in the daily instruction of their classes. Secondly, it supplements the text-book at a point where the best of text-books can hardly fail to be weak. It goes beyond the limits of political epitome, and shows, by the very character of its topics, how broad and how deep a subject history is. "Although," says the preface, "this volume is designed primarily for higher educational purposes, it is believed that it will also prove of interest to the reading public at large." Should this forecast prove incorrect, so much the worse for the reading public.

—The question whether Catholicism contains the progressive elements necessary to adapt itself to every real advance of mankind and thus become reanimated by the spirit of the age, has recently excited considerable discussion in Germany. In proof of this, we need only refer to such works as 'Der Katholicismus als Princip der Fortschritts' and 'Die neue Zeit und der alte Glaube,' by Professor Schell of the University of Würzburg; 'Reformkatholicismus,' by Dr. Müller of Munich, and the series of "Kirchenpolitische Briefe," by the late Prof. F. H. Kraus of the University of Freiburg in Baden in the *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung*, since 1895. The latest publications of this kind are 'Der Katholicismus und das Zwanzigste Jahrundert im Lichte der kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit,' by Dr. Albert Ehrhard, professor in the University of Vienna (Stuttgart: Roth); and Prof. Friedrich Jodl's "Gedanken über Reform-Katholicismus,' just issued by the Neuer Frankfurter-Verlag. The sensation created by Professor Ehrhard's work is evident from the fact that the first edition was exhausted in ten days, and that the twelfth has just appeared. He asserts that, however much the papacy as a secular power may have promoted culture and exerted a wholesome influence in the Middle Ages, the temporal sovereignty of the Pope is now obsolete, and, if restored, would be a serious hindrance to the Catholic Church in the fulfilment of its mission. Another obstacle is the order of the Jesuits, whose supremacy in the Vatican must be utterly overthrown. Professor Jodl, who has the chair of ethics in the University of Vienna, and is an exceedingly liberal-minded and sharp-sighted thinker, commends Ehrhard's courage and conscientiousness and the nobleness of his purpose, but holds that the proposed reform would involve such radical changes in the essential character of Catholicism as to be equivalent to its extinction as an ecclesiastical organization. The arguments in support of this view are presented with admirable clearness, and are likely to be accepted by all unprejudiced readers as conclusive. We may add that the theological professors and their clerical allies in Vienna rendered Ehrhard's position there so unpleasant that he resigned, and was then called to a professorship in the University of Freiburg in Baden.

—Petrarch, it is well known, between the years 1343 and 1373 inclusive, was honored with five embassies from various potentates, civil and ecclesiastical—to Naples, to Venice, to Prague, to Paris, to Venice again. The first three were in the nature of political negotiations; in the last two the poet's part was purely ornamental. A sixth embassy had altogether escaped notice till brought to light at the Paris Congress of International History in 1900. It was discovered by Monseigneur Fraknoï, inspector-general of museums and libraries in Hungary. This scholar, as one may read in the first volume of the *Annales* of the Congress just published by Armand Colin in Paris, while engaged in the Vatican archives in researches on Louis the Great, King of Hungary, discovered a letter of Pope Clement VI. to the lord of Verona, Martino de la Scala, dated Avignon, November 13, 1347. Louis was preparing a descent upon the kingdom of Naples to avenge the assassination of his brother Andrew, and the Pope's letter begged Scala to refuse transit through his domains to the King's forces. He accredits to him, "pro parte nostra," "dilectus filius magister Franciscus Petrarchi clericus Florentinus." It was already common knowledge that Petrarch quitted France in November, 1347, for Italy, for literary purposes, *e. g.*, to make a collection of Cicero's works. Several letters written by the way are preserved, the most noted that to his friend Cola di Rienzo, dated Genoa, November 27, 1347, intimating that it had been his intention to proceed to Rome, but that the news meanwhile received of Cola's actions, unauthentic though it might be, decided him to turn his steps elsewhere. "Flecto iter."

—The importance of the document now revealed lies in the inconsistency involved in Petrarch's holding a commission from the Pope who had on October 7 declared Cola a rebel, and was aiming, in the embassy to Scala, against the Roman tribune as well as against the King of Hungary, and the patriotic impulse heretofore ascribed to Petrarch on setting out from Avignon—namely, to ally himself at Rome with Cola. The latter was, as the Curia well knew, in negotiations with Louis. Monseigneur Fraknoï concludes that we must view the letter as a purely literary production, "addressed to the general public of amateurs of this kind of prose." Parallel cases might easily be drawn from the epistles of Erasmus. ("He *must* be literary," says his biographer, Professor Emerton; "he *might* be accurate.") At all events, Petrarch proceeded straight to Verona, with the poor luck that attended all his other serious missions. On December 4, Louis was received at Vicenza by Scala's brother and son, and conducted with pomp to Verona, where he was sumptuously entertained for four days.

THE MASTERY OF THE PACIFIC.

The Mastery of the Pacific. By Archibald R. Colquhoun. With maps and illustrations. The Macmillan Co. 1902.

Early in the sixteenth century the Portuguese swept south and east from Goa and seized Malacca, on the Malay Peninsula, and ten years afterward occupied the Moluccas, the Spice Islands of commerce. But nearly all of their acquisitions have been absorbed by the Dutch. Almost simultaneously the Spaniards, under the foreign Magellan, discovered Cebu in the Philippines, and fulfilled the Papal condition for possession by converting all the inhabitants in eight days. Forty years later, Legaspi, with the aid of the Augustinian friars, after a six years' campaign, actually overpowered and took possession of the islands that lay north of Mindanao; and ever since Spain has nominally ruled the whole archipelago and the unimportant Ladrone and Caroline groups, although until

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

within the last decade the Moros remained vigorous protestants. In fact, at the time of our own invasion, our predecessors were still engaged in extending their authority among those people by force of arms.

Three hundred years ago the Dutch, by arms and trade together, began their Pacific dominion, which, after various fortunes, now embraces a compact group of mighty and productive islands. These are held and managed purely in the commercial interest of Holland, with a supervision that is a curious mixture of interference and neglect, not always as radical or as remunerative as more nervous nations might employ. Java, as is well known, became a garden by a peculiar system of forced labor now somewhat mitigated, which compelled the natives to work a certain part of each month without payment, after the feudal fashion. For the rest of the time, either they were paid by the Government or their privately raised produce was sold by compulsion at a fixed price. Their natural sloth was overcome by coercion, but the native chiefs were the medium through which this discipline was enforced.

We cannot intelligently discredit the author's opinion that the hold which Holland as a nation has upon the great Netherland India is gradually relaxing, nor his prediction as to the ultimate fate of both. He believes that the retrograde assimilation of the colonists with the natives is weakening the home ties, and that the negative attitude of the national Government towards those possessions foreshadows their loss. Even the prolonged Achinese war is prosecuted by the colony, not by the nation, and is absorbing the revenue that otherwise would go to The Hague. In Mr. Colquhoun's view, Germany will hold the mouths of the Rhine ere long, and with them will secure a tropical island empire which neither the courage nor the obstinacy of the Dutch may suffice to defend. As outposts the Carolines, the Bismarck archipelago, parts of the Samoan group and of New Guinea, are already under the German flag. The prophecy may come true. France, with her ineptitude for colonizing, is negligible, notwithstanding certain insular possessions and her foothold on the continent of Asia. The Japanese hold the north and west of the Pacific. These spirited, artistic people, more acute than profound, the Latins of Asia, may hereafter emerge at the head of the yellow race in a struggle for commercial and material preëminence. But that prospect is now remote, and they have not yet demonstrated their qualification as colonists. Formosa, a trophy of war, is a trial ground for foreign command where their immediate success is not conspicuous. The Chinese, whose continent is washed by the Pacific under other names, are emigrants but not colonists. They show no disposition to create new Chinas, but, with characteristic conservatism, preserve their own qualities, neither making proselytes nor adopting the ways of others. Submissive to government, they appreciate justice and fair dealing, meet oppression with guile, and make no attempt to govern others. But they maintain a rigorous system of authority and of mutual assistance among themselves wherever they may be, and in that sense they organize well. With their commercial instincts and their undeveloped resources, adequate administration might cover the ocean with their fleets and make them masters of its trade. But this would require such an awakening as only Japan has shown possible.

The great South Pacific Power is the Australian Federation, a better example than even Canada (for it is homogeneous) of what Britons can do with themselves when away from home and under their own flag. A colony in name, it is a nation in fact, and, despite the imperial glamour of yesterday, which led her to waste men and money on the South African veldt in a quarrel in which she had no concern, we may be pretty sure that, when Australian interests clash with those of Britain, the latter will be disregarded. Race feeling may make Australia a British ally in emergency; it will not keep her subordinate when she thinks she has the right of way. Two pressing problems there are those of tariff and labor. Regardless of her home teachings and practice, the colonial Federal Government insists upon a tariff midway between one for revenue and one for protection. This operates against New Zealand, which declined to enter the Federation, as well as against more unrelated countries, and draws its circle of exclusion closely about the island continent. But as a policy it may be open to debate, for the State of New South Wales contains a strong free-trade party. The labor question seems settled determinately against the admission of the dark-skinned races. People who are not white are not wanted, and the Australians are about to exclude through education tests even their fellow-subjects of India. The end of 1906 is the date fixed for the departure of any Pacific Islander who may then be present.

Our own vital concern in this Pacific problem lies with the Philippines, and here we find the author an intelligent, well-informed historian and critic, who is sympathetic and friendly, neither exaggerating nor making light of our burden. There is none of the exultation which the English sometimes show over our entanglement in extra-continental expansion. "This ends the Monroe Doctrine," and "Now you are practically by our side," are common expressions and commoner sentiments among the Britons of controlling grade in the East, who see logical inconsistency in maintaining that America is only for Americans when we absorb outlying lands of Asia. Mr. Colquhoun is thoroughly, but not offensively, British when he discusses our affairs, whose importance he marks by devoting to them the principal section of his volume. We find there the views of a sagacious and experienced observer, a distinct well-wisher, whose mental equipoise and long acquaintance with that side of the world give those views great value. That he should have some bias towards ways that have brought success to Britain is natural, and may readily be discounted at the final settlement. He cannot feel, as an American must, the full pressure of the unfamiliar problem; but, relieved from immediate responsibility for action, he is the better equipped for observation and advice.

Our author does not concern himself with how or why we went to the Philippines, but only with the actual and probable consequences. Of these, space permits merely the briefest abstract. He insists with authority that "no such problem has ever presented itself to Great Britain or any other colonizing Power as that which confronts the United States in the Philippines." The essential requirement is to fit the Filipino character for the administration of American democracy. This involves either the regeneration of a race, or the forced adaptation of a political system to absolutely repugnant conditions. As studied by Mr. Colquhoun, the Filipino lacks certain civic essentials without which a state cannot stand. Thus, he has no public spirit in the wide sense. The peasant will follow a personal leader, but not from patriotism. Brave and reckless when properly led, bright and hospitable in his private relations, he lacks the spirit that welds together a people into homogeneousness. Individually and collectively his characteristic is "untrustworthiness, added to the power of deceiving the most vigilant." "He is a half-civilized, clever, irresponsible child, who has warped ideas of right and wrong." "He is never honest, as we count that virtue, never truthful, and never industrious or persevering." "The Malay is the laziest of Orientals, and the Filipino is not the least lazy of Malays." Mr. Foreman, the highest authority, declares: "The best of the natives neither appreciate, are grateful for, nor seem to understand a spontaneous gift."

Mr. Colquhoun does not concede his distrust of our efforts "to thrust the results of centuries of struggle and progress [as found in America] ready-made upon the half-fledged Filipino." "If the little brown brother were altogether simple and amenable, the danger would be less, though still considerable." "If unnaturally stimulated, he may grow up into a Frankenstein." He frankly insists that the introduction of modern education to overcome at one stroke for the next generation the evil tendencies of the Filipino, half hereditary and half following misgovernment, will be futile because, beautiful as is the theory, "it involves an entire subversion of the laws of nature," for the education which creates character "cannot be crammed in a few years." He foresees that there will be let loose "a mass of half-educated, conceited natives . . . who will turn their attention to promulgation of sedition or equally undesirable practices," and cites India in illustration. He by no means deprecates education, but looks with the utmost favor upon our costly and extraordinary efforts in that direction, which have no parallel, provided too much reliance is not placed upon it; and he urges, as a *sine qua non*, that the civil service should be pure, firm, and intelligent from top to bottom. Inasmuch as a system of quasi-independence, which he does not approve, has been instituted, his final advice, as one "who has seen a good deal of government in Oriental countries, is to interfere as little as possible with the customs, prejudices, and religion of the Filipinos, and to keep a tight hold." That we may relinquish the islands, even to themselves, does not seem to occur to him as possible.

The Anglo-Japanese alliance had not been made when this book was written, but the author hoped that Japan might pursue a policy in common with the aims and interests of Britain and America, which he assumes will coincide. He foresees the geographical importance of Japan, and would align its policy with those of the English-speaking countries in whose keeping he confidently rests the "Mastery of the Pa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cific." The true mastery of the Pacific is commercial supremacy, which implies neither armies, colonies, nor aggressive fleets. Men-of-war there must be for patrolling distant waters; there need be none for challenge. The example of a self-contained continental nation, secure in moral strength, with recognized ability for defence, whose commerce reaches every land, and whose learning and good-will are the common property of humanity, tells further as a world-power than an arm outstretched for conquest.

Regardless of questions of state, or rather because of them, this volume, the discussion of which has been unavoidably delayed, is heartily commended as the clearly expressed views of an expert whose feelings are those of a cosmopolitan Briton with American impulses. Excepting that the author makes a Chinese fleet towards the close of the thirteenth century escort Marco Polo "from China to Europe" (p. 15), his facts are as trustworthy as his descriptions are lucid.

CHEYNE AND HASTINGS.

Encyclopædia Biblica. Edited by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. Vol. III. L—P. The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. xviii, 650.

A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. Vol. IV. Pleroma-Zuzim. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902. Pp. xii, 994.

With the closing volume of one, and the second last of the other, of these encyclopædias their relative importance, their objects and values have become fairly clear. That they do not compete with one another as a whole or in any exact sense is abundantly evident. Yet precisely where the differentia lies is not so evident. Part is undoubtedly the contrast of the theological as opposed to the historical. The Hastings dictionary is theological not simply in that it includes articles on theology—in this volume, notably on Predestination, Promise, Psychology, Salvation—but also by general attitude. So the thing had to be and is; not, as in Cheyne, so it historically was. Part, also, is due to the personality of the editors. Dr. Hastings might easily have exercised a greater control over his contributors and levelled up the quality of their work; to Dr. Cheyne this was evidently an opportunity for the freeing of his soul, and he has certainly freed his soul to an extent which probably no other editor has ever dared to approach. In the present volume, besides numberless small articles, he has written sixteen articles of importance and collaborated in as many more. On his contributors, too, his hand has clearly been heavy in guidance and annotation. The only province which Dr. Hastings, on the other hand, has claimed for himself is that of the obsolete and obscure words used in the English versions. Part, again, can be ascribed to a different standard of scholarship. But this aspect could easily be pushed too far, and it would certainly not be correct to assert broadly that Hastings is intended or suited for the plain man and Cheyne for the professional student. For there are articles in Hastings which no scholar can afford to disregard, and if often it gives no sign of a difficulty, often also it gives the materials to judge more soberly of the difficulties raised in Cheyne.

The advantage to the student of the many-sidedness of view thus produced cannot easily be overestimated. For example, the article on Put in Hastings is by W. M. Müller; in Cheyne by Dr. Cheyne himself. Yet generally W. M. Müller has charge of the Egyptology in Cheyne, to the great advantage of that book. Contrast, for example, his with Driver's Potiphar—a good article in itself but somewhat second-hand. Why Dr. Cheyne, in this case, elected to write on Put is most obscure, unless it was in order to get in Jerahmeel. Other examples of such weighty articles in Hastings are Budde on Poetry (11 pages, and much better than Duhm in Cheyne), Davidson on Prophecy and Prophets (20 pages), Sanday on Son of Man, and Driver on Son of God (9 and 10 pages), Wolff Baudissin on Priests and Levites (30 pages; the corresponding articles in Cheyne are short). As in the former volumes of Hastings, the articles showing most precise scholarship are the theologically non-contentious. Here Nestle has been a tower of strength, and gives 17 pages to Septuagint, 7 to Syriac versions, 9 to text of N. T., and 12 to Sirach—all admirable. Further, H. J. White gives 17 pages to Vulgate; Strack 6½ to text of O. T.; Kenyon 13 to Writing. On the other hand, the Hastings articles on separate Biblical books are notably feeble and hesitant. A good example is W. T. Davison's treatment of Psalms, and an outstanding exception is F. C. Porter's 26-page article on Revelation. Another source of weakness in Hastings is the preference, over professional students, for writers whose training has been of a practical kind in Palestine. Thus, G. Post of Beirut on natural history gives good general information based on present conditions, but exhibits lamentable scholarship, and draws most dubious Biblical conclusions. The writers in Cheyne are often less ample and picturesque in description, but are evidently on firmer ground. The same holds of Sir Charles Wilson's geographical articles. Even F. J. Bliss, first-hand authority as he is, does not give as good an account of Pottery as the more stay-at-home J. L. Myres.

Turning now to Cheyne, it is more than hard to give any adequate conception of the wealth of learning and ingenuity which this volume displays. The outstanding characteristics are the same as before. Articles most happily compounded abound. In other cases the suspicion will not down that behind the compound lies editorial history. As before, the 'Britannica' articles of Robertson Smith have been brought to date, if not ahead of it, by Dr. Cheyne himself. In some cases the supplement is so extensive that the stem might well have been omitted, or the reader referred to the 'Britannica' itself. Thus, on Psalms, Dr. Cheyne adds a wholly admirable sixteen pages to the original seven. Prophetic Literature is an equally admirable but entirely new article of twenty-four pages. It is highly and hardly intelligibly compounded, being written by Cheyne, Guthe, Paul Volz, and, for Christian Prophets, J. A. Robinson. A good example of the advantage of the compounding method at its best is the article on Purim. In it, instead of one hypothesis, we are given three, by C. H. W. Johns, J. G. Frazer, and Cheyne; the last regards not only Mordecai, but Daniel, as corruptions of the omnipresent Jerahmeel. On this whole question of Jerahmeel an open mind must clearly be kept until the appearance of 'Critica Biblica.' It is to be trusted that that book will amply justify Dr. Cheyne's critical methods. At present, to the profane, his use of Jerahmeel cannot but seem like Mr. Dick's obsession by King Charles's head. There is hardly an article written by him into which it does not find its way, and, apparently, almost all the corruptions of proper names in the Old Testament have sprung from a rooted hostility to it on the part of the Hebrew scribes.

But, in estimating this and other matters in Cheyne, due weight must be allowed to the avowed attitude and plan of the editor. His desire, reiterated in this volume at many points, is not to give assured, accepted results, but to shake up the old, to discard, to suggest. For him, explicitly, the new is best even if uncertain. He seeks to give a collection of problems, a collection of material for solving them, and of possible, even if varying, solutions. "Even to be mistaken," he says, on col. 3940, "would have been less misfortune than to be thrown back on the dim, colorless exegesis of Hupfeld and his school." Granted the legitimacy of such an attitude in an encyclopædia, the destructive, querying character of the present book can be amply justified.

Further, in the present volume, it is again on New Testament rubrics that we find the most revolutionary articles. The Dutch school has now formally taken possession; Van Manen comes to support Schmiedel. His article, Old-Christian Literature, in its very title, is a challenge, and is followed up by a thoroughly negative treatment of Paul. In this latter case, it is true, we are given a choice of the less radical criticism of the Tübingen school in a reprint of the late E. Hatch's article from the 'Britannica.' Beside these, Dr. Cheyne's own article on Moses, which reduces or expands him to a tribe, is mild. On Names also Dr. Cheyne writes, and adds a long paragraph in defence of his many criticisms of the tradition of proper names in the Hebrew text. Having thus relieved his mind, however, the way is clear for Nöldeke, Kautzsch, and G. B. Gray to contribute a monumental treatise on Names in thirty solid pages. Another most weighty monograph which must be mentioned is Ed. Meyer's seventeen pages on Phœnicia.

To sum up: the professional student will use Cheyne first and last. He will refer to Hastings to see if it by chance contains an article of weight. Such search will often repay him. The plain man, and for this purpose the term must cover the enormous majority even of clerics, will be compelled to the use of Hastings. Much of Cheyne will be unintelligible to him; more will be misleading. If he has the instinct to avoid these two dangers, then his gain also may be great. Certainly no just view of the Biblical science of to-day can be attained without the use of both. Is it symptomatic of the position of the said science that, to appearance, an adequate encyclopædia of it—an encyclopædia, that is, in the ordinary sense—cannot yet be written? Hastings marks a past stage; Cheyne marks a period of chaos; the time is clearly not yet ripe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Poem of the Cid. Edited and translated by Archer M. Huntington. Vols. I. and II. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Spanish scholarship in America has an illustrious history. The first of our great scholars in point of time, George Ticknor, is still the first historian of Spanish literature in point of excellence; Longfellow's graceful translation of the 'Coplas' of Manrique has made it almost as familiar here as on its native soil; while Lowell—"unable to speak the language, though knowing more of it than almost any of them," as he proudly boasts in one of his letters—has, alike in prose and in verse, given evidence of his admiration for the genius of the Spaniards and his knowledge of their historic culture. There was something in our own romantic past and in the heroic imagination which saw the savage stretches of the West dared and conquered, that gave us kinship, and a more than intellectual sympathy, with the race whose valor and energy drove back the Moorish invader step by step, unified a mass of divergent kingdoms, and, in another hemisphere, won for itself the gigantic fruits of its own discovery. These are the three great stages of Spanish history—the victory over Islam, the unification of the peninsula under the hegemony of Castile and Leon, the discovery and colonization of the Americas; and the first of these stages, with some foreshadowing of the second, has received literary expression in one of the noblest monuments of Spanish poetry, the famous 'Poem of the Cid.'

The 'Poema del Cid' is for Spanish literature what the 'Chanson de Roland' is for French and the 'Niebelungen Lied' for German, and in date of composition it falls approximately half way between the two. The firm touch of the French epic it does not possess; but in the rapid narrative succession of its events, in the splendid epic spirit which transfuses it as a whole, and in the simplicity of its heroic ideals, it expresses, as no other Spanish work of the imagination has succeeded in expressing, its age, its race, and its country. Lope and Calderon are mirrors of their own time—both are typical Spaniards of the seventeenth century; but only the 'Poem of the Cid' and 'Don Quixote' express in every age and clime the genius of the Spanish race.

It is this remarkable poem which Mr. Huntington seeks to introduce to a wider American audience in the two ornate volumes under review. The first, which contains the Spanish text, was published several years ago, and attracted some attention among scholars; the second, with a metrical translation of the poem into English, has just appeared; and a third volume, with critical and explanatory notes, is expected to complete the whole work. Until this last volume appears, it will be impossible to place any final estimate on the nature of Mr. Huntington's scholarship, but his interest in things Spanish has been known to cultivated readers for some time, and any contribution he may make to his favorite studies must at least receive respectful attention.

The 'Poem of the Cid' has been preserved in a single manuscript of the fourteenth century; the scribe was a careless one, and the poem as we have it is irregular in metre, often obscure in sense, and teeming with errors; but all critical texts must of necessity be based on this unique copy, which is now in the possession of a private gentleman of Madrid. Three editions before the appearance of Mr. Huntington's were based on a careful study of the manuscript, that in the "Colección de Poesias Castellanas anteriores al Siglo XV." of Sanchez, that of Janer in the "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles," and Vollmöller's, published in 1879. Of these the last is by far the best, and Mr. Huntington has in the main followed Vollmöller's reading of the poem. In fact, Señor Menéndez Pidal, the latest editor of the epic, asserts that Mr. Huntington has not departed from Vollmöller's text in a single essential point, and a careful comparison of the two has tended only to corroborate this statement. Mr. Huntington has not contributed any significant emendation of his own or added anything to our better understanding of the poem; and for philological purposes his edition cannot compare with the more recent one of Menéndez Pidal, which is an exact palæographical transcript of the original manuscript.

As a translator, however, Mr. Huntington has rendered more important services. As early as 1808, John Hookham Frere published, in an appendix to Southey's 'Chronicle of the Cid,' translations of a few selected passages from the poem, and these were reprinted in 1874 with several interesting additions, in his collected 'Works.' Frere's renderings are remarkable for their spirit and dash; and their flowing and colloquial verse has been praised by judges as competent as Southey and Ticknor. The passages selected are typical, but they do not cover more than a fifth of the entire poem, and the long, barren stretches of epic recitation are left unrepresented. They suffer chiefly, however, from looseness in translation; as in his famous Aristophanic renderings, Frere has attempted to give the spirit of the original rather than to translate it with literal accuracy. A second version, that of the late John Ormsby, appeared in 1879, with an introduction and notes. This is more complete; all the important passages appear in metrical translation, and the rest of the poem is represented by condensed prose paraphrases. Better work, so far as it goes, could not be looked for. Ormsby is a faithful and spirited translator, and has performed his task with a gusto that is contagious.

Mr. Huntington has rendered the whole poem, line for line, in blank verse, and his is therefore the first complete English translation. For the most part accurate, it suffers from the medium which he has chosen for its rendering. The metre of the original, in the corrupt manuscript which we possess, is very irregular, but the norm may be said to be the line of seven iambic feet. This is our own ballad metre, and the rhythmical effect is not unlike that of Macaulay's "Lays of Ancient Rome." Both Frere and Ormsby have therefore used the ballad metre, and the result in general is splendid. The dignity of blank verse wholly fails to give the spirit and rush of the original versification, though the freedom from rhyme makes the task of literal translation simpler. Yet the lack of rhyme seriously affects the interest of Mr. Huntington's version in the prosier portions, and in the more vivid passages spoils some of the poem's dash and simplicity. Frere's happy but careless methods are shown in the following passage:

"The story of the lion should have taught you shame at least.
You rushed out at the door, and ran away so hard
You fell into the cesspool that was open in the yard.
We dragged you forth in all men's sight, dripping from the drain;
For shame, never wear a mantle, nor a knightly robe again."

This is vigorous verse; but, as Ormsby has pointed out, there is no "cesspool" or "drain" or "dragging" in the original. Diego Gonzales is taunted with having hidden behind the beam of a wine-press, and spoiled his beautiful garments so that he will never be able to wear them again. Ormsby's and Mr. Huntington's versions of the passage follow:

"For you to boast! the lion scare have you forgotten, too?
How through the open door you rushed, across the courtyard flew;
How sprawling in your terror on the wine-press beam you lay?
Ay! never more, I trow, you wore the mantle of that day."

"Shouldst not forget the story of the lion!
Didst through the portal fly and place thyself
Within the court, didst go to hide behind
The wine-press beam, but ne'er again didst wear
Thy cloak nor tunic."

Ormsby has here corrected the more obvious errors of Frere without losing the latter's vigor and spirit, but Mr. Huntington's is even more faithful to the original. Diego did not mount the wine-press beam, but hid behind it (*tras la viga lagar*), and not only his mantle, but also his lower garment (*brial*) was spoilt for ever. Both Ormsby and Frere, however, give a more vivid impression of the surging flow of the original, with its ballad metre and its resonant rhyme. But it is no slight merit, after all, to have rendered the whole of a great work like the 'Poem of the Cid' into English verse for the first time, and to have performed the task with fidelity and distinction.

In conclusion, attention should be called to the beautiful dress of these two volumes, which represent the final excellence of the work of the De Vinne press. The full vellum binding, the clearly marked typography, and the photogravure illustrations of Spanish scenes are alike to be commended, though the curved lines placed at the end of every verse seem to us an innovation of doubtful merit, both trivial and distracting.

Music in the History of the Western Church. With an Introduction on Religious Music among Primitive and Ancient Peoples. By Edward Dickinson, Professor of the History of Music in the Conservatory of Music, Oberlin College. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.

Nothing in this book is more remarkable than the inequality of its workmanship. We easily distinguish two strata of work, one which, taken alone, would make an excellent book, and another of very inferior quality. It seems clear that a group of well-studied essays on portions of the author's subject has been enlarged to the supposed necessary bulk by adding extraneous and superfluous matter neither original nor well compiled. These two portions of the work might have been written by two several authors. The larger shows a careful student using well-digested material and displaying clearness of thought, originality, and a pleasing though somewhat careless literary style. In this part Mr. Dickinson is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perspicuous, even when discussing subtle matters of theory; rich and sometimes graceful in illustration, temperate in phrase-making and in the use of epithets. In the other part he is obscure, wordy, abounding in hollow phrases and conventional art jargon, and staggers under a load of ill-chosen, vague, and needless adjectives. *Nihil fuit unquam sic impar sibi.*

Whatever fault we have to find with this book must be understood to belong chiefly to its superfluous portions. One criticism, however, which applies in some measure to the whole, concerns a habit acquired, no doubt, in the course of teaching. A lecturer is not expected to give his authority for every statement; but when he turns his lectures into a book, he should cheerfully submit to a law which the profoundest scholars have respected, and support by reference to accepted authorities all assertions of facts not readily ascertainable. An assertion, for example, that the myths of Greece represent the gods as dancing, and the ritual dance as an imitation of theirs, might not need to be proved to scholars familiar with the Homeric hymns, if Mr. Dickinson counts on many such; but the statement (p. 6) that the myths of *many* nations do so, needs support for almost any reader. So, too, the assertion (p. 8) that the Hellenic ritual dance was *adopted* by the Romans, a conjecture intrinsically improbable, even if we did not know that the Italians had ritual dances of their own long before they ever came in contact with the Hellenes. The reader might ask for proof, or at least authority, as to any recognized use in the early Church of dancing round the altar (p. 8); as to the symbolism of ancient Egyptian and Hindu music (p. 11); for the assertion that much of the musical art of the Greeks came from Egypt, and for a good many others of the same absolute sort. The lecturer may reasonably claim from his audience a frequent *acte de foi* such as Edmond About wittily defines as "l'opération d'un homme qui ferme les yeux pour mieux voir." He is permitted to adopt the principle of "Open your mouth and shut your eyes, I'll give you something will make you wise"; but the modern reader of serious books does not want to be treated to kindergarten methods.

As to this writer's peculiarities of language and style, we must really leave it mainly to the reader to discover them. It will suffice to mention a very few. To say nothing of such a monstrosity as *orchestik* (p. 8), the reader will be rather staggered, we conceive, by such expressions as "*drastic* descriptive literalism" (p. 179), "*lustrous* sound tints," "quick to *sense* devotional demands" (p. 387), "changes in *spiritual emphasis*" (p. 388), "the ruling *postulate*" (p. 139, referring to demands of public taste), "periods of *relapsed* zeal" (p. 79), and the qualification of Gounod (p. 216) as "so *liable* or perhaps so neutral in his art."

The habit of phrase-making, so dear to the art critic, and a certain tendency to enter into the enthusiasms and opinions of the author he may be momentarily using, betray Mr. Dickinson into frequent inconsistencies. Thus, we learn (page 11) of the symbolism of Egyptian music; on page 39, Music has "no associative symbolism, like poetry." On page 80 we hear (with no little amazement) of the "*terse* embodiment" of ideas in the Roman liturgy; but on page 83 the Mass is "an elaborate development" of the Last Supper. On page 85 all parts of the Mass "are designed to . . . prepare the officers" (meaning the officiants) "and people to share in" the eucharistic sacrifice, "and to impress on them its meaning and effect"; but on pages 90, 91 the service is logically in Latin "because the Mass is not considered as proceeding from the people, but is performed for them and their name." How, being in Latin, it can impress any meaning on the people we are not told. Again, on page 95, the liturgic chant is "a sort of religious folk-song proceeding from the inner shrine of religion," while on page 109 Gevaert is approvingly quoted to the effect that it is derived from the purely secular κιθαρῳδία of Roman private life.

We cannot always commend Mr. Dickinson's logic. The argument, for instance, on page 21, that the Hebrews invented no musical instruments because theirs are all found among nations older in civilization, would prove that sewing-machines were not invented in America because they are used in Japan. On page 82 he first postulates that a Universal Church must have a universal form of speech; his next assumption is that this "must inevitably be the Latin." There is no attempt to prove either proposition, though the reader cannot be supposed to forget that the only church which ever had the least claim to be called universal, the original church of Jerusalem, was notoriously Greek, as was also, for that matter, the original church at Rome. These views of our author must be classed, we suppose, with his surprising enthusiasm for the decrees of Trent (p. 156), his admiration of Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order (*ibid.*), and his absurd claim (p. 62) that the Papacy dates back to the fourth century—mere echoes, we will hope, of the books consulted while writing on the Roman liturgy.

We turn with real pleasure to the agreeable duty of giving Mr. Dickinson the praise which he deserves for many excellent things. When on his own ground, he can be exceedingly interesting. His history of the Sequences (p. 121, *seq.*) and his chapter on Organum and Discant are sure to delight and instruct readers not acquainted with systematic histories of music. Still more pleasing is the account of the birth of modern opera; and the author's views on Palestrina, on the Cantata and Passion Music, and the chapter on Bach are very good and profitable reading. We may also commend the chapters on Mediæval Chorus Music, on the Lutheran Hymnody, on Anglican Church Music, and on the Congregational Song of England and America. The last chapter, on Problems of Church Music in America, will be found of unquestionable value. When at his best, Mr. Dickinson often rises to a plane of really excellent writing. On page 163 he makes a beautiful comparison of the gently shifting harmonies of certain music with the play of light on a sunlit, breeze-swept meadow. He has also a decided aptitude for epitomizing history in a philosophical way. We regret that space will not permit us to quote his acute characterization of the Anglican Reformation (p. 325) and some other thoughtful passages which we have found most suggestive, even when not convincing. Readers who may have read with surprise the statement (p. 229) that Lutheran congregational song is derived from an ancient habit of ejaculating "Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison" chorally on solemn occasions, may be interested to know that the fact is confirmed by a passage, overlooked by Mr. Dickinson, in that curious ninth and twelfth-century poem, "Reynardus Vulpes," where, on p. 38 of Mone's edition, we read that (the multitude)

> "Salve festa dies" cantabat, ut usque solebat
> In primis feriis, et "Kyri" vulgus "ole";

where the *tmesis* of Kyriole (*i. e.*, Kyrie Eleison) in the pentameter will amuse the classical scholar.

A History of the Peninsular War. By Charles Oman, M.A. Vol. I. 1807-1809. With maps, plans, and portraits. Henry Frowde. 1902.

The question which will arise in the mind of every one who sees this title, may as well be answered at once and in Mr. Oman's own words:

"More than one friend," he says, "has asked me during the last few months whether it is worth while to rewrite the history of the Peninsular War when Napier's great work is everywhere accessible. I can only reply that I no more dream of superseding the immortal six volumes of that grand old soldier than Dr. S. R. Gardiner dreamed of superseding Clarendon's 'History of the Great Rebellion' when he started to write the later volumes of his account of the reign of Charles I."

In this passage Mr. Oman terms Napier a "grand old soldier," but it becomes quite apparent from what follows that he holds his illustrious predecessor guilty of gross partiality. As a narrator of the incidents of the war, Napier is unrivalled; but when he wanders off into politics, English or Spanish, he is a less trustworthy guide. Those who have read the recently published letters of Lady Sarah Lennox will be quick to apprehend the chief point in Mr. Oman's criticism of her son. For example, the quotation which we gave from her letter regarding the death of Lord Edward Fitzgerald shows how deep was her sympathy for the popular cause as well as for a beloved and unfortunate kinsman. The same liberalism (and it may well have been strengthened by her friendship with Fox) was communicated to her sons. Charles Napier had more than a little of it, and in the case of William it took a most unusual form. Himself a soldier in the bitter struggle of which he wrote the story, he had something like hero-worship for Napoleon. At a time when Nelson was bidding every midshipman hate the French as part of his duty, Napier saw in the national foe a true apostle of liberty. It is related of Lord Raglan, who served his apprenticeship in the Peninsular War, that before Sebastopol he spoke of the enemy as "the French," even when he was in conference with his French allies. Napier had none of this feeling. He disliked and despised the Tory administrations which were conducting affairs during the Peninsular War. He even seems to have anticipated the view of Napoleon's character which arose in France at the time of the Bonapartist revival under Louis Philippe. We are not surprised to encounter a "Populist" estimate of the Emperor in the pages of Mr. Watson, but there is some

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ground for wonder when we encounter it in the work of a British historian who risked his life a hundred times and was wounded almost unto death, in the Peninsula. Mr. Oman is only recalling facts when he says:

"In his preface, Napier goes so far as to say that the Tories fought the Emperor not because he was the dangerous enemy of the British Empire, but because he was the champion of Democracy, and they the champions of caste and privilege. When the tidings of Napoleon's death at St. Helena reached him (as readers of his 'Life' will remember) he cast himself down on his sofa and wept for three hours."

To carry out a comparison between Napier and Mr. Oman would be a long matter, and such a contrast is quite unnecessary. The differences of situation will occur to those who have not read the present work, as well as to those who have. During the past two generations a vast amount of new material has been disclosed, and upon this Mr. Oman's history is largely based. The author trusts that "it will not be considered presumptuous for one who has been working for some ten or fifteen years at the original sources to endeavor to summarize in print the results of his investigations." A particular reason which has had to do with the writing of this book may also be mentioned. Sir Charles Vaughan, the diplomatist, collected at the time and on the spot a great amount of information which has never been used. In the manner of Thucydides and Froissart, he sought out leading personages, asked them questions, and set down what they told him when the events were fresh in mind. After many years his papers have come by legacy into the possession of All Souls College. Apparently they have never been opened since his death. Having these to start with, and the Record Office to fall back upon, Mr. Oman has essayed to write a new, exhaustive, and accurate history of the Peninsular War. He promises a bibliography in the next volume, but there is enough already to show that he has not set out in any light-hearted spirit to supplement the eloquent and classical work which all the world knows.

Mr. Oman is much more friendly towards the British Governments of 1808-1814 than Napier was, and speaks a bold word on behalf of "Castlereagh's splendid service to England." He is likewise more lenient towards the Spaniards, despite "the cruelties of the guerrillas, the disgraceful panic on the eve of Talavera, the idiotic pride and obstinacy of Cuesta, the cowardice of Imaz and La Peña." He listens to the representations of Arguelles, Toreño, and Arteche on behalf of their countrymen, and will not accept any statement of fact which does not regard the Spanish as well as the French contention.

If we were to pronounce judgment upon the work from the evidence of the first volume, we should lay special stress upon the statistical and topographical excellence which it displays. Should the same standard in these respects be maintained throughout, Mr. Oman will deserve to be ranked high among the historians of intricate campaigning. For most readers the centre of interest in the first volume will be the last section, in which are described Sir John Moore's advance to Sahagun, his retreat before Napoleon and Soult, and the battle of Corunna. Mr. Oman, viewing Moore as a general rather than a man, can see a good many shortcomings that are concealed from Napier. For instance, he lays stress upon a certain over-conscientiousness under responsibility, the moral effect produced by fear of losing "not a British army, but *the* British army." On the other hand, he has warm praise for Moore at his best. "He was a man of courage and honor, and at the critical moment recovered the confidence and decision which was sometimes wanting in the hours of doubt and waiting."

Mr. Oman thinks that Napoleon interfered in Spanish affairs because he thought himself a second Charlemagne, rather than because he was trying to "force the Continental system upon every state in Europe." But we are unable to take up in detail either the military or the political features of this important book. It is enough to say that it enhances the reputation which Mr. Oman has already made by his 'Art of War in the Middle Ages.'

Le Mécanisme de la Vie Moderne. Par le Vicomte G. d'Avenel. Paris: Armand Colin.

This is the fourth volume of the series of sketches which M. d'Avenel has been writing, at the request of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, on some aspects of modern life generally neglected by the historian. Having heretofore studied the big department stores and the organization of horse races, the financial companies and the manufactures of paper or silk, he gives us, in the present book, some first-hand information on the great dressmakers and milliners of Paris, the advertising departments of the press, the theatrical business in all its ramifications, and the money-lending institutions, both public and private.

M. d'Avenel's method is easily explained. He generally starts out knowing little or nothing about the institution or the business that he expects to describe. Like a conscientious reporter, he goes, pencil in one hand and note-book in the other, to visit the principal places of interest; he interviews the men who know all about it, and gathers from them as many facts, figures, and characteristic anecdotes as he can. When he has done that, he thinks of giving a little historical background to his essay. Being skilled in historical research (he is the biographer of Richelieu), he looks up the old documents and always finds interesting facts on the origin of so-called modern institutions. At last, since he has a philosophical bent of mind, he meditates somewhat on the why and wherefore of things, and, with this mixture of facts, figures, anecdotes, philosophical remarks, and witty sayings, he makes up those entertaining and instructive articles which he gathers under the happy title of 'Mécanisme de la Vie Moderne.' In this latest group of studies, those who do not care to penetrate the mysteries of the dressmakers' shops of the Rue de la Paix, or to know how many rabbits it takes to manufacture our hats, will find a chapter full of information on the business aspect of the press of to-day, and a very complete and readable sketch of the French theatres. The future historian of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries will be grateful to M. d'Avenel for his exemplifications of our modern civilization.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Adams, C. C. An Elementary Commercial Geography. D. Appleton & Co. $1.10.
Adams, John. The Minor Prophets. (Bible Class Primers.) Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribners. 20 cents.
Adams, R. C. Good without God. Peter Eckler.
Amery, L. S. The Times History of the War in South Africa, 1899-1902. Vol. 2. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co.; New York: Scribners. $20.
Bacon, Francis. Essays or Counsels Civil and Moral. London: George Newnes; New York: Scribners. $1.25.
Baedeker, Karl. London and its Environs. Leipzig: Karl Baedeker; New York: Scribners. $1.80.
Bagot, Richard. The Just and the Unjust. John Lane. $1.50.
Banister, H. C. Musical Analysis: A Handbook for Students. London: William Reeves; New York: Scribners. 75 cents.
Boas, Franz. Kathlamet Texts. Washington: Government Printing-Office.
Bond, A. K. How Can I Cure My Indigestion? The Contemporary Pub. Co.
Burdick, F. M. The Essentials of Business Law. D. Appleton & Co. $1.25.
Cadness, Henry. Decorative Brush-Work and Elementary Design. London: B. T. Batsford; New York: Scribners. $1.40.
Campbell, George. A Revolution in the Science of Cosmology. Topeka: Crane & Co.
Chase, Eliza B. In Quest of the Quaint. Philadelphia: Ferris & Leach.
Correct Social Usage, by Sixteen Distinguished Authors. 3 vols. The New York Society of Self-Culture.
Cox, W. V. Celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Establishment of the Seat of Government in the District of Columbia. Washington: Government Printing Office.
Cramer, Frank. Talks to Students on the Art of Study. San Francisco: The Hoffman-Edwards Co.
Cunningham, J. T. Sexual Dimorphism in the Animal Kingdom. London: Adam & Charles Black.
Cyr, Ellen M. The Advanced First Reader. Boston: Ginn & Co. 30 cents.
Dalman, Gustaf. The Words of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribners. $2.50.
D'Annunzio, Gabriele. The Dead City. Chicago: Laird & Lee. $1.25.
Delitzsch, Friedrich. Babel and Bible. Chicago: The Open Court Pub. Co.
D'Esterre-Keeling, Elsa. Sir Joshua Reynolds. P. R. A. (The Makers of British Art.) London: The Walter Scott Pub. Co.; New York: Scribners. $1.25.
Diekhoff, T. J. C. Lessing's Nathan der Weise. American Book Co. 80 cents.
Duff, M. E. G. An Anthology of Victorian Poetry. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $2.50.
Earl of Iddesleigh. Luck o' Lassendale. John Lane. $1.50.
European and Japanese Gardens: Papers Read Before the American Institute of Architects. Philadelphia: Henry T. Coates & Co. $2.
Gardiner, J. H., Kittredge, G. L., and Arnold, Sarah L. The Mother Tongue. Book II. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Ginn, Edwin. Scott's Lady of the Lake. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Holborn, Alfred. The Pentateuch in the Light of To-day. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribners. 75 cents.
Hunt, W. C. Census Report for 1900: Population. Part II. Washington: United States Census Office.
Irving, Washington. Sketch Book. 2 vols. (Caxton Series.) London: George Newnes; New York: Scribners. $2.50.
Isaac Pitman's Shorthand Instructor. Rev. ed. Isaac Pitman & Sons.
Jekyll, Gertrude, and Mawley, Edward. Roses for English Gardens. (The "Country Life" Library.) Scribners. $3.75.
Jessup, Alexander. The Best of Stevenson. Boston: L. C. Page & Co. $1.25.
Lanier, J. J. Kinship of God and Man. 2 vols. Thomas Whittaker. $1.
Manson, J. A. Sir Edwin Landseer, R. A. (The Makers of British Art.) London; The Walter Scott Pub. Co.; New York: Scribners. $1.25.
McCartney, John. The Story of a Great Horse: Cresceus, 2:02¼. Indianapolis: The Hollenbeck Press.
Miller, E. D. Modern Polo. New ed. London: Hurst & Blackett; New York: Scribners. $5.
Ostini, Fritz von. Uhde. Leipzig: Vellhagen & Klasing; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Phin, John. The Shakespeare Cyclopædia and New Glossary. The Industrial Publication Co. $1.50.
Pryor, G. L. Neither Bond nor Free. J. S. Ogilvie Pub. Co.
Shelley, P. B. Poetical Works. London: George Newnes; New York: Scribners. $1.25.
Sidis, Boris. Psychopathical Researches. G. E. Stechert.
Strachan, James. Hebrew Ideals. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribners. 60 cents.
Tolman, H. C. Urbs Beata. Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Co. 75 cents.
Toward the Rising Sun. (Youth's Companion Series.) Boston: Ginn & Co.
Turton, W. H. The Truth of Christianity. Milwaukee: The Young Churchman. $1.25.
Vignaud, Henry. The Letter and Chart of Toscanelli. London: Sands & Co.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $3.
Westcott, F. N. Catholic Principles. Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Co. $1.25.
White, Grace M. A Harmless Revolution. J. S. Ogilvie Pub. Co.
White, Horace. Money and Banking. Second ed. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Wisser, J. P. The Tactics of Coast Defense. Kansas City (Mo.): Hudson-Kimberley Pub. Co.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Recent and Forthcoming Works in History and Modern Languages

FROM THE LIST OF

Henry Holt & Co.

29 WEST 23D ST., NEW YORK
378 WABASH AVE., CHICAGO
Branch for text books only.

Seignobos's Roman People. Translation edited and brought down to Charlemagne by Dr. Wm. Fairley. With maps and numerous illustrations. 528 pp., 12mo, $1.25 *net.*

"Messrs. Henry Holt & Co. have done a real service to the classical student in issuing this excellent translation. . . . The narrative is distinctly readable, and although crowded with information, possesses that charm of leisurely case which is so typically French. . . . Ought to find a quick and cordial reception in our schools and colleges, as well as by the general reader."—*New York Commercial Advertiser.*

—— Feudal Régime. Translated by Prof. E. W. Dow, University of Michigan. 70 pp, 8vo, paper, 50c. *net.*

Bemont and Monod's Mediæval Europe, 395-1270. Translation edited by Prof. G. B. Adams, of Yale. 554 pp., 12mo. (*Sept.*)

Gordy's Political History of the United States. Vol. II. 1809—28. 12mo $1.75 *net* (postage 14 cents).

"May be read not only by beginners, but by almost anybody with profit. Written in a clear and simple style, and entirely non-partisan."—*Nation* on Vol. I.

Vol. I., 1783-1809, is a well-rounded history of the Federal period. $1.75 *net* (postage 14c.).
Vol. III., 1819—60. (*In Preparation.*) Vol. IV. 1860 to Cleveland's election. (*In Preparation*).

Pancoast's Standard English Prose. About one hundred selections (most of them complete in themselves) from Bacon, Walton, Sir Thomas Browne, Faller, Milton, Jeremy Taylor, Cowley, Bunyan, Dryden, Defoe, Swift, Addison, Steele, Johnson, Goldsmith, Burke, Coleridge, Southey, Lamb, Landor, Hazlitt, De Quincey, Carlyle, Macaulay, Newman, Froude, Ruskin, Thackeray, Matthew Arnold, Pater, and Stevenson. 676 pp., large 12mo (*early in September*).

Alden's Specimens of English Verse. By Prof. Raymond M. Alden author of "The Art of Debate." (*In Press.*)

Thomas and Hervey's German Reader and Theme Book By Prof. Calvin Thomas and Wm. A. Hervey, Columbia. 438 pp. $1.00 *net.*

Prof. J. H. Gorrell, Wake Forest College, N. C.:—"A thoroughly practical reading-book containing fresh selections and admirably graded. The exercises based upon the text form a welcome combination of the grammatical applications of the familiar exercise-book with the advantages of the use of the natural method in exercise work."

The Life and Works of Schiller. By Professor Calvin Thomas. *Student's Edition. Without illustrations.* 483 pp. 12mo. $1.50 *net.*

"The first comprehensive account in English of Schiller's life and works which will stand the test of time. . . . It can be enjoyed from beginning to end."—*Nation.*

The Poems of Schiller. Translated by E. P. Arnold-Forster. 361 pp. 12mo. $1.60 *net.* (Postage 12c.)

A new and comprehensive edition of Schiller's poems, exclusive of his dramas.

"The book looks well, and the versions are the best there are—the best, I should think, that any one will ever make."—*Prof. Calvin Thomas of Columbia.*

SUPPLEMENTARY EXERCISES TO WHITNEY'S INTRODUCTORY GERMAN READER. By Marian P. Whitney, Hillhouse High School, New Haven. 28 pp. 16mo. (*In press*).

TEXTS.—FULDA'S DER TALISMAN. Ed. by Dr E. Meyer, Western Reserve Univ. (*Sept.*).

—— UNTER VIER AUGEN and BENEDIX: DER PROZESS. Ed. by Wm. A. Hervey. With Vocabulary. 135 pp. 35c. *net.*

KLEIST: MICHAEL KOHLHAAS. Ed. by Dr. Wm. Kurrelmeyer, Johns Hopkins. xxv.+149 pp. (*August*).

WIEDEMANN: BIBLISCHE GESCHICHTE. Ed. by Prof. L. A. Rhoades, Univ. of Ills. (*Sept.*).

François and Giroud's French Reader. By Victor E. François, University of Michigan, and Prof. Pierre F. Giroud, Girard College. (*In Press.*)

For very early reading. It includes composition exercises.

TEXTS.—AUGIER: UN BEAU MARIAGE. Edited by Prof. W. S. Symington of Amherst. (*In Press.*)

MALOT: SANS FAMILLE. Abr'g'd. Ed. by H. P. Thieme, Univ. of Mich. With Vocabulary ix+219 pp. 40c. *net.*

MÉRIMÉE: QUATRE CONTES. (*Mateo Falcone, L'Enlèvement de la Redoute, Tamango*, and *Le Coup de Pistolet.*) Ed. by Prof. F. C. L. Van Steenderen, Univ. of Iowa. With Vocabulary. xiii+122 pp. 35c. *net.*

RACINE. ANDROMAQUE, BRITTANICUS and ATHALIE. Ed. by Prof. F. M. Warren, Yale. (*Oct.*)

Ramsey's Spanish Grammar. With Exercises. By Prof. M. M. Ramsey of Leland Stanford University, author of *An Elementary Spanish Reader*, etc. 610 pp. 12mo. $1.50 *net.*

The Nation, which has not yet reviewed this book, said of the author's earlier and larger "Text Book of Modern Spanish": "We mention it because of the very great advance it shows over all existing Spanish grammar in English. This applies to almost every detail of the work."

YALE STUDIES IN ENGLISH. 8vo., Paper.—A STUDY IN EPIC DEVELOPMENT By Dr. Irene T. Myers. 159 pp. $1 *net.* THE SHORT STORY. By Henry Seidel Canby. 80 pp. 30c. *net.*

THE AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS (list on application) have been taken over by Messrs. Henry Holt & Co.

AN INSPIRING BOOK.

THE CODE OF JOY.

BY

CLARENCE LATHBURY

Price 40 cents.

A Strong and Entertaining Novel.

Leaves from a Life-book of To-day.

BY

MRS. JAMES E. MILLS

(Jane Dearborn Mills)

Price 50 Cents.

Swedenborg Publishing Association

Germantown, Pa.

JUST PUBLISHED.

The TEACHING of CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL.

(*American Teachers Series. New Volume.*)

By Alexander Smith, B.Sc., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Chemistry in the University of Chicago, and Edwin H. Hall, Ph.D., Professor of Physics in Harvard University. With 21 Diagrams, and References and Bibliographies. Crown 8vo, about 380 pages, $1.50.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,

Publishers, New York.

Chief Justice Marshall.

Photogravure with fac-simile of autograph on plate paper, size 19x24 inches, with India tint and plate mark, $5 each.

Copies will be sent securely packed, with charges prepaid, on receipt of price.

F. GUTEKUNST, Photo., 712 Arch St., Phila.

An unsolicited opinion of Justice Mitchell, Supreme Court of Pa.

"My Dear Sir—Inman's Portrait, painted for the Phila. Bar, is the only one that was considered by the contemporaries of the great jurist as a representative likeness, and your photogravure from the original painting reproduces it with exact fidelity of feature and expression.

"Of all the very numerous copies, it is by far the best and most satisfactory to those who value fidelity of likeness as the prime requisite of portraiture.

"Yours truly,
"James T. Mitchell."

"F. Gutekunst, Esq."

Chickering Pianos

The OLDEST *in* AMERICA;
THE BEST *in the* WORLD

WRITE FOR CATALOGUE

Chickering & Sons

PIANO FORTE MAKERS
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

A. S. CLARK,
174 Fulton St., New York City,
Dealer in back numbers of periodicals.

OLD BOOKS AND MAGAZINES | Send for Catalogue. Address A. J. CRAWFORD, 10th & Pine Streets, St. Louis, Mo.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED